~~B. 7. 8~~
F. 47 5 130

A VINDICATION OF THE FRIENDLY CONFERENCE,

BETWEEN A

MINISTER AND A PARISHIONER

Of His inclining unto

QUAKERISM, &c.

732

From the Exceptions Of *THOMAS ELLWOOD*, in his pretended Anſwer to the ſaid *Conference*.

By the ſame Author.

Job 21. 34.

——*In your Anſwers there remaineth falſhood.*

LONDON,

Printed by *Sam. Roycroft*, for *R. Clavel*, at the Peacock at the Weſt end of St. *Pauls*. 1678.

Novemb. 20. 1677.

IMPRIMATUR;

Guil: Jane.

B. 7. 8
F. 47 5 130

A VINDICATION OF THE FRIENDLY CONFERENCE,

BETWEEN A

MINISTER AND A PARISHIONER

Of His inclining unto

QUAKERISM, &c.

732

From the Exceptions
Of *THOMAS ELLWOOD*, in his pretended Answer to the said *Conference*.

By the same Author.

Job 21. 34.

——*In your Answers there remaineth falshood.*

LONDON,

Printed by *Sam. Roycroft*, for *R. Clavel*, at the Peacock at the West end of St. *Pauls*. 1678.

145.102

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The EPISTLE to the People called QUAKERS, from the Author.

I *Suppoſe that many of you are acquainted with a little Book, called* A Friendly Conference, between a Miniſter and a Pariſhioner of his inclining unto Quakeriſm; *However you eſteem of the Arguments, yet I hope that ſome of you have the charity to believe, that no by end, no indirect purpoſe whatſoever, induc't me to the publication of it. No, the ſearcher of all hearts bears me witneſs, that I was mov'd to the undertaking from the trueſt Principle of charity and kindneſs, to diſcover to you your miſerable miſtakes, the Sandy bottome upon which your Tenents are founded, and the real danger your poor Souls are in, by your obſtinate perſiſting in ſo deſperate a ſchiſm.*

Though (Bleſſed be God) this Book has had its wiſhed effect upon ſome, yet others have loaded it with all the calumnies they well could invent, miſrepreſenting both its deſign, & argument; And more openly one Thomas Ellwood *in a late virulent Pamphlet, Nick-Named* Truth prevailing and detecting Error----. *venting therein not only his ſpleen againſt me, but againſt the whole Conſtitution and Government of the Church of* England, *as it is now happily eſtabliſht by the Supreme Autho-*

rity of this Nation. In Communion of which Church our Pious Anceſtors both liv'd and dy'd, and your ſelves too were both born and baptized.

When I found ſuch an immodeſt and fantaſtick Title, I began to ſuſpect, what afterwards was confirmed to me, (viz.) *that He had placed the empty Name of* Truth *Rampant in the Title page, but nothing of the thing in the Book it ſelf.*

Had I not underſtood, with what mighty applauſe my Adverſaries Book was received among you, I had not given my ſelf the trouble of this Vindication, but anſwer'd him in ſilence, as in all probability I ſhall do, for the time to come.

I had drawn my Vindication much larger than now I preſent it to the World (being very unwilling to allow My Antagoniſt any one Paragraph in his whole Book) which I found had ſwelled the Volume too big; wherefore I delayed the publication hereof in order to contraction, fearing otherwiſe that my Book would be too large for the Buſie to read, and too dear for the Poor to buy.

This Book had ſooner ſeen the light, had not ſome of my Sheets as they were ſent to the Preſs, unfortunately miſcarried: And though it come ſomewhat late, yet I hope not unſeaſonably or leſs welcome to you.

You

You will find me often complaining of the Diſhoneſty of my Adverſary in mis-ſtating My Book in many places of it; and alſo of his disingenuity in pretending to anſwer it, when in truth He has paſſed by the moſt material paſſages of it. If therefore you would impartially judge between us, then compare the Books together, and you will eaſily diſcern whether He has done me right. Next compare his Book with this reply, then do you judge, whether or no I have done him right.

I had been much larger upon the Subjects of Inſpiration and Tithes, Had not T. E. *been taken particularly to task by two other Pens, which you will find me mentioning afterwards.*

You will find that I generally make uſe of T. E's *own Authors, but how honeſtly He has repreſented them, as ſome others of your own party, from whom he has taken them, will appear in its place.*

I know not what opinion you may have of me, but if I know my own Soul, it is your Eternal intereſt and welfare, that I have been aiming at, as well in this, as my former undertaking; that I may ſhew you, how ridiculous and Nonſenſical your Tenents are; and if I ſometimes ſearch into your Wounds till they ſmart, it's more that I may be faithful to you, than any ways for to pleaſe my ſelf.

You will find that ſometimes I mention the

ſayings

ſayings and actions of ſome Quakers, yet conceal their Names, which I do for this only reaſon, that I may ſhew not my unkindneſs to your Perſons, but Opinions.

I wiſh you would ſeriouſly conſider, with what woful mediums and artifices your Leaders divert you from the truth, and hoodwink you in your errors. For when any has attempted your Converſion, then muſt they be traduc't with Slanders, and Calumnies: As ſuch an one is, or was a Presbyterian, or an Army-Chaplain, &c.--*Thus do they accommodate themſelves to the paſſions, and uncharitable humours of Men, and take Sanctuary in Dunghils and Puddles: as if they thought your Religion better defended by Dirt than Arguments: accordingly* T. E. *threatens me with an* Adjunct† *in caſe I ſet not my Name to my next: But what he means, I know not, having (I thank God) no particular guilt, that in the leaſt makes me concern'd at it. I am ſenſible that I have Infirmities as well as other Men, yet I can modeſtly ſay, that I do not indulge my ſelf in any thing which I know to be ill. But I wonder why the publiſhing of my Name muſt excuſe me? And ſeeing he knows me ſo well (as he makes his Reader believe) why has he not the Charity, and Chriſtianity, to inform me what this Adjunct is, that I may amend it?*

† dolus latet in generalibus.

But

But let him publiſh his Adjunct when he pleaſes, My Comfort is, that neither He, nor his Maſter, *can go any further than God is pleaſ'd to ſuffer them: only let me adviſe* T.E. *(for his credits ſake) not to take his* Adjunct *upon* Truſt, *as (it ſeems)* He *did his Ancient Authors, leſt* He *come off with as much ſhame in the one, as he has done in the other.*

How much better had He *been imploy'd, had he gone about to have heal'd, and not (as* He *do's) to widen our unhappy breaches? nay rather than you ſhall want an Argument for Schiſm, he will make* ſuſpicion *a ground thereof: I muſt confeſs he puts in* where I have great ground to ſuſpect——*But then there is difference between ground to believe,* and ground to ſuſpect; *for be the ground never ſo great, it's ſtill but in order to a ſuſpicion.*

One thing I do aſſure you, that I have not ſaid that thing in this following Tract, which I thought not the very truth, (ſo far as my judgment did guide me.) With this integrity I have proceeded, and can with the greater hopes expect God's bleſſing on my labours.

Had I thought my Name would have been any ſatisfaction to you, you ſhould have had it before, however you muſt not wonder, that you want it now, being ſo rudely threatned to it.

God open your Eyes, is my Prayer to Heaven for you——Yours——

The

The Contents.

THE *Introduction* page 1

Chap. 1. *Of the preſent Miniſtry of* England, *and the cauſe why ſome People are not profited by it, inquired into* p. 6

Chap. 2. *Of ſaying* [*You*] *to a ſingle perſon* p. 59

Chap. 3. *Of Titles and Civil Reſpects* p. 78

Chap. 4. *Of Confeſſion* p. 111

Chap. 5. *Of Perfection* p. 120

Chap. 6. *Of Swearing* p. 160

Chap. 7. *Of Taking Texts* p. 264

Chap. 8. *Of Humane Learning, and Divine Inſpiration and Revelation* p. 268

Chap. 9. *Of Tithes* p. 293

The Concluſion p. 331

A VINDICATION OF THE Friendly Conference, &c.

From the Exceptions of THOMAS ELLWOOD.

The Introduction.

Miniſter. Neighbour, I am glad to ſee you: I hope you have well digeſted our late Conference about the erroneous Tenents of the Quakers, and continue as well ſatisfied, as you ſeem'd to be at our laſt parting.

Pariſhioner. I cannot deny the ſatisfaction, I then receiv'd; Only I have been a little amuſed, ſince the publiſhing of it, by an Anſwer to it, lately extant under the name of *Thomas Ellwood.*

Min. I hope you remember the Caution I gave you, *Not to conclude every thing unanſwerable, which you cannot anſwer your ſelf: your education and employment not qualifying you for finding out the fallacies of every Sophiſter.*

Par. I have not forgot your Counſel; therefore am I come on purpoſe to conſult you in ſeveral paſſages of that Book.

Min. I have peruſed it my ſelf, and find nothing in it fit to be made an occaſion of ſcruple;

as I doubt not but (with the Divine Assistance) to make clear to you, before we part.

Par. Seeing you did not Print your Name with your Book, T. E. *conceives that omission disingenuous (not to say dishoneſt)* and asks, *if you were afraid or ashamed openly to avouch it?* Preface.

Min. The concealing of my Name imports no such thing, seeing there are other causes which may make it proper.

Par. But *you write your self a lover of truth; therefore, since truth seeks no corners, what should induce you to conceal your Name?* ibid.

Min. Though truth seeks no corners, yet may truth notwithstanding have a Friend in a corner. But will it follow, That because I conceal my Name (for reasons best known to my self,) I conceal the truth even then, when I publish it to the world? or that I am not a lover of it? or that my Book is not the truth? No sure: But it's this Quaker that conceals and darkens the Truth by deceitfully jumbling things thus together without distinction; as if there were no difference between an *Author* and his *Book*, between *Truth* and a *lover of it*, and all this, merely to cast a mist before you.

Par. Indeed I do the more wonder at him, because he confesses *that men are not strictly tyed in all cases to affix their names to whatever they write.* ib.

Min. And well you may, for here he contradicts himself, and has made his Objection as ridiculous as it was fallacious; for *if they be lovers of the* Truth, then are they tyed (by his Rule) in all cases to affix their Names.

Par. But he tells his Reader, *that in matters*

of

of controverſy (eſpecially where one Man ſhall charge another) the Opponent in point of honeſty, is obliged to give his Name, as a Caution and Security to make good his charge.

Min. It's not the Author's *Name*, but *reaſon* and *truth*, wherein conſiſts the worth and credit of a Book: Theſe ſecure all men from ſuffering injury from the Contents thereof. If truth be ſpoken, who is ſlander'd? The guilty know they are not, therefore need not the Author's Name for Caution: And for my part, I have laid no charge to any party, but what I am ready to make good, when need ſhall require; and until I fail of that, no Man can accuſe me of diſhoneſty.

But there are two things which I ſhall offer to your conſideration: Firſt, Whether a *bare Name* be a ſufficient caution and ſecurity? Secondly, Whether he has not involv'd the Author to the Hebrews, and his own party in this accuſation of diſhoneſty, being guilty of the ſame Omiſſion? As for the firſt, what if the Name of *Thomas Ellwood* be fictitious? Or ſuppoſe it be the true Name of mine Adverſary; ſtill without the mention of his habitation, to direct me where to find him, it looks like an illuſion, and a deſigned piece of mockery, while his Perſon *lurks* and *ſkulks* as much as my Name, yea and more; for it ſeems he could be readily inform'd both of it and the place of mine Abode. But for that malicious Charge which in divers places of his Book he brings not only againſt the Clergy, but the whole Conſtitution of the preſent Government, being moſt notoriouſly falſe (as

will be made evident) and the place of his abode not being affixed with his Name, where then is *our Caution* and *Security*?

Par. But to your other particular; How can the Author to the Hebrews be included in this charge?

Min. Becauſe a great part of his Epiſtle is controverſial; and further he taxes ſome particularly with the enormous crime of *Schiſm*, and *Separation* from the publick Aſſemblies of Chriſtians; *Heb.* 10. 25. *Not forſaking the aſſembling of our ſelves together*, **as the manner of ſome is**; Then he ſhews in the next verſe the great miſchief of the ſin of *Separation*, as bordering upon, and bringing them into the danger of final Apoſtaſie, or the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *for which there remains no more Sacrifice*, v. 26. Is not here a dreadful charge, though no Author's name for caution? and yet his honeſty was never queſtioned.

Par. Did the Epiſtle to the Hebrews come into the World without the Name of its Author?

Min. Yes, it did: For it was long diſputed among the Ancients who he was; Some affirming St. *Luke* to be the Author, ſome *Barnabas*, others *Clemens Romanus*: At laſt, it being (for good reaſon) concluded that it was St. *Paul*, His Name was affixed to the Title of it.

But whoever was the Author, happy was he in this, that *Ellwood* lived not in his days, for had he found out the *concealed Author, who and what he was, his name, place*, &c. *by a parity*

7. E. himſelf ſeems not ignorant of this; and therefore (as muſt in reaſon be ſuppoſ'd) calls him the Author to the Hebrews. p. 96. C. 104.

rity of reaſon (a phraſe of his) and according to his impertinent and malitious threats againſt me, *did he not put his Name to his next, after ſo fair a warning, he muſt not have thought much*, if Ellwood ſhould *have given the World his Name, with ſuch an Adjunct, as ſo unmanly a dealing did deſerve.*

Par. But to let that paſs, what Quakers do you charge with this Omiſſion?

Min. In a certain Book entituled [*Some Principles of the elect People of God, in ſcorn called Quakers*] I find ſeveral points undertaken by ſeveral of them; Some of them indeed ſubſcribe their Names, but moſt of them do not; And I obſerve, and ſo may you by conſulting the Book, that ſome of thoſe who have not affix'd their Names, bring the moſt railing accuſation againſt us, and particularly the *ſecond* of them, who charges *us with going in the way of* Cain, *to envy, murther, perſecute*, and a great deal more of ſuch like ſlanderous and abominable ſtuff: Now where muſt we find out the writer of it? The *third* Quaker and others are not wanting in this railing Divinity, which it ſeems, is a Principle of the Quakers. Printed in the Year 1671. p. 6.

Par. I remember the Book very well, and do wonder, you mention the *third* Quaker in it, when he has ſet the firſt Letters of his Name, and ſubſcribed himſelf *G. F.*

Min. G. F? Who's that? It may be another * *Guy Faux with his dark-lanthorn*, or any other perſon whoſe Name begins with thoſe Letters. This therefore being no ſure indication

* Whom he compares me to in his Preface.

dication of the Writer, makes nothing for the Caution and ſecurity required.

So that if theſe Quakers be innocent, then *Ellwood* is an accuſer of his Brethren; And it will concern you to obſerve alſo, that for all the confidence the Quakers have in that Spirit by which their Teachers ſpeak and write, here muſt needs be ſome miſtake, yea diſhoneſty, either in theſe *writers* of theirs, who omit to ſubſcribe their Names to ſuch virulent Treatiſes, and conſequently in *that Spirit* by whoſe inſtigation they publiſh'd them, or elſe in *Ellwood* and *his Spirit*, that accuſes all ſuch of diſhoneſty who do ſo; Here then you may ſee, that there are contradictions and delulions among the Quakers and the Leaders of them.

Par. Truly this is ſo reaſonable an Advertiſement that I cannot object againſt it, and ſhall therefore ſeriouſly conſider of it.

Min. Having now given you an account as well of the Logick, as Ingenuity of my Adverſary, from his Preface, Let us examine the Book it ſelf.

CHAP. I.

Of the preſent Miniſtry, and the cauſe of ſome People's not profiting under it inquir'd into.

PAR. T.E. tells his Reader, that you *lay the foundation of your diſcourſe upon that Queſtion*

ſtion which I told you was *propounded by a Quaker in one of their meetings, Whether any among them could affirm, that he had received any ſpiritual advantage by his long frequenting the Steeple-houſes?* And whereas in your Anſwer you affirmed, that the Miniſtry is not to be judged from the effects it has upon careleſs and indiſpoſed hearers;

Min. What then?

Par. The Queſtion (ſays he) *is not concerning careleſs and indiſpoſed hearers, but in general terms, Whether any among them impartially conſulting his own Conſcience, could affirm that he had received any ſpiritual advantage by his long frequenting the Steeple-houſes? So that drawing it from any to careleſs and indiſpoſed hearers only, you rather avoid the Queſtion, than anſwer it.* pag. 2.

Min. Thoſe non-proficients, who have forſaken our Aſſemblies, had they not been careleſs and indiſpoſed hearers of us, they had better profited by us; This therefore is a true Character of them, and reaches all thoſe to whom the Queſtion was propounded, being ſuch as had left their lawful Paſtors, and forſaken the Orthodox Faith, and Church, wherein they were Baptized and brought up; Or other giddy perſons reſorting to them to gratify their itching Ears. My reply then being as comprehenſive as the Queſtion, how was it avoided, when it was fully anſwered?

Par. This however is obſervable (ſays he) *that we have an implicit acknowledgment of*

the Peoples not profiting under the present Ministry.

Min. Do's he suppose then that my words take *all* the People into the charge of non-proficiency?

Par. He seems so to do in saying, that you acknowledge that *the people are not profited*, as also by his way of connecting it to his following discourse.

Min. Your observation is very reasonable, in that he brings both this and the next passage which he cites out of my Book, under the same acknowledgment, and cry's out that *I have given up my cause*, p.4. But do you not remember what was before charged upon *these* very words, as if they were so scant and *particular* as to avoid the Question? and is this *same* clause now made so *large* by him, as to include *all* the People? This puts me in mind of the famous Thief *Procrustes*, who used his Captives with so much cruelty, that what Stature soever any of them were of, they must be fitted to the length of his Bed; If they were too short, then they must be rack'd; if too long then must so much of their Legs be chopt off, to fit them to it. Thus must a clause of mine be one while shortned, otherwhile lengthen'd, according to the torture he hath design'd it: Yea this Quaker seems to be more cruel than ever *Procrustes* was said to be, while he practises both kinds of tyranny upon one and the same Limb.

Par. But to proye this acknowledgment of yours, he says that *it is more freely confest by you*

you afterwards in theſe words, Alas, it's our hearts grief that our People ſhould come into the Church, as Beaſts into Noah's *Ark*, &c. p. 3.

Min. This is a ſophiſtical and uſual trick of his, to ſtretch out an indefinite propoſition to a General, making me to accuſe *all* the People, when I did no ſuch thing, but expreſly explain'd my ſelf and affirmed that, *If you and others have not profited, I can inſtance in thoſe that have*, &c. Conf. pag. 7.

Par. What do you mean by an Indefinite Propoſition?

Min. It is ſuch as in the terms of it expreſſes neither a particular, nor a general, but may mean either [*all*] or [*ſome*] as the ſenſe is determin'd by what goes before or follows after. And this of mine being thus plainly determin'd by that which follows in my Diſcourſe, and by the whole tenor of it, I have juſt cauſe to complain of the injuſtice of this Quaker in judging me, before he hears me out, forgetting what the Wiſe man ſaith, *Prov.* 18.13. *He that anſwers a matter before he hears it, it is folly and ſhame to him.*

Moreover this way of conſtruing words and ſentences will neceſſarily impoſe a falſe and blaſphemous ſenſe upon many texts of Scripture. Take this inſtance. *He came unto his own, and his own received him not*, John 1.11. Gal. 3.1. 1 Cor. 3.3. and 6.8.

Now according to *T. E.* this is an implicit acknowledgment that Chriſt had not a People among the *Jews* to receive him, whereas the contrary is manifeſt: The meaning of it then

then must be, that *some* or *most* of them did not receive him. So that you see the Quaker makes a fine tool of an *Indefinite* to work with-all, purposely leaving out the restrictive term [*some*,] slily to engage inconsiderate Readers to understand it of *all*. By this piece of craft he would make them believe that I accuse *all* Ministers too as scandalous, in that idle passage
p. 15. of his, *The Priest himself pleads guilty, acknowledging the scandalous lives of Ministers.* Where he sets down *Ministers* indefinitely; but according to his construction you may see he would have it understood of *all*; or else, what means that ridiculous insultation of his, *habemus confitentem reum?* although my words expressly restrain the sense by a note of particula-
Conf. p. 11. rity, where I say not *all*, *but some Men for a*
p. 12. *corrupt interest will intrude*, &c. As also that *I hope these scandalous Ministers will prove but few, when compared with such as truly thirst after the honour of God in a faithful discharge of their duty.* Here you may have a full view of the Quaker's honesty.

Par. But (says he) *however the Priests have fed the People, it is evident the People have fed the Priests well, for they are grown fat and wanton, &c.* p. 3.

Min. But while such a number of the *Priests* are so slenderly provided for; And while the *People* are so *wanton* as to kick at their Lawful Pastors; it may be easily inferr'd, who is the better *fed* of the two.

Par. Next he comes to enquire into the causes,

ſes, *why the People are not profited under your Miniſtry. We read* (ſays he) *of ſome in former times, who did not profit the People at all; and the reaſon thereof is alſo given*, &c. *In the 23d. of* Jeremiah, verſ. 30. *the Lord by the Prophet ſaith, Therefore behold, I am againſt the Prophets that ſteal my Word every one from his Neighbour: Behold, I am againſt the Prophets, ſaith the Lord, that uſe their Tongues, and ſay, He ſaith: Behold, I am againſt them that propheſie falſe dreams, ſaith the Lord, and do tell them, and cauſe my People to err by their lyes and by their lightneſs, yet I ſent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they ſhall not profit this People at all, ſaith the Lord,* v.32. *Here the very Ground and Reaſon why that Miniſtry did not profit, nay why it was rendred uncapable of profiting the People at all, is moſt plainly given by God himſelf,* viz. *He ſent them not, nor commanded them.* p. 4.

Min. That this Scripture does not reach his purpoſe, will be evident, if we conſider, 1. That this non-proficiency of ſome of the People do's not inferr that we are not ſent, ſeeing it may proceed from other cauſes. In the careleſs hearers of *Jeremiah* it proceeded not from any corruption in his Doctrine, which was Divine, nor of his Life, which was Holy; but *from the hardneſs of the Peoples hearts, in that they would not hearken.* In the hearers of the falſe Prophets, it proceeded from *their dreams, lyes, and lightneſs*, which they taught, *and to which the People truſted.* 2. That this Scripture is ignorantly and

Jer.6.7.

Ch. 28.15.

and injuriously applied to the present Ministry, appears in that those false Prophets perswaded
Chap. 14. 13. the People (and that to the ruine of that Nation) *that* Jerusalem *should not be destroyed,*
Chap. 23. 17. *that they should neither see Sword nor Famine.* Which was an Errand upon which God never sent them. Besides, they were a company of Fanatick Enthusiasts, who cheated the People by false pretences to extraordinary inspirations; *I*
v. 25. *have dreamed, I have dreamed* was their canting note.

Not to profit the People then] is in the true sense of this Scripture, *not to secure them* from the Captivity and Calamities hanging over that Nation.

Now let us examine how truly this Scripture is applied to the present Ministry; Do *We* come with any new Errand to the World, or pretend to extraordinary inspirations to confirm it, as those did? Or do *We* Preach peace to impenitent sinners? No; the contrary is well known. So the words do rebound upon the Quakers themselves, while in their strange doctrines and misconstructions of Holy Scripture, they are guilty of the same fault with those lying Prophets in saying, *The Lord saith, when he hath not said*; and in their presumptuous pretences to Revelation to confirm it; as also in opposing the true Ministers of God, as those Fanaticks opposed *Jeremiah*.

Par. But he denies your Ministry, when he saith, *Hath God sent them, or do they send one another? That they are Ministers of Mans making*

making common experience ſhews. page 6.

Min. I anſwer; The Miniſtry in general is diſtinguiſht into Ordinary and extraordinary. Thus it was under the Law, and under the Goſpel too: Of old the Prieſthood belonged to the head of every Family, challenged by a right of primogeniture: But when the Houſe of *Iſrael* multiplied into many Families, it pleaſed God for the more advantageous ſettlement of his Church, and the better Government thereof, to devolve the Prieſthood upon *Aaron*; and to call him to the ſame in an extraordinary manner, by a Commiſſion from Heaven to *Moſes* for his Conſecration; and to ſettle that Prieſthood ſucceſſively upon his Poſterity without any further need of an extraordinary Call to the Prieſts of ſucceeding Generations. Such too was the Evangelical Miniſtry; For *Aaron*'s Prieſthood being antiquated, The Apoſtles were called to their Function in an extraordinary manner even by Chriſt himſelf, and by the viſible deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt were accordingly qualified for the diſcharge of it: Yet even in the Apoſtles days this Extraordinary Call ceaſed; For *Timothy* and *Titus* were Ordain'd by impoſition of hands, and were commanded *ſo* to Ordain others, by which means the Miniſtry was by the Divine Ordinance to deſcend to all Ages in an orderly ſucceſſion, though not in one Family as *Aaron*'s did. Tit. 1. 5. 2 Tim. 2. 2

Theſe things thus premiſed, do determine our preſent caſe as followeth. He that is ſent according to the order appointed by God in Holy

Holy Scripture (though by the Miniſtry of men)
Lev. 8. 2. is not a Miniſter of man's making but of God's: But both the Prieſts of the Law, and the Prieſts of the Goſpel, though conſecrated and Ordained by the Miniſtry of Men, were ſent according to the order appointed by God; Therefore they were not Miniſters of Man's making, but of God's, and by him truly *call'd* and *ſent*.

Were *Timothy* and *Titus* Miniſters only of Man's making, becauſe they were ordain'd by impoſition of hands? And if many of the people did not profit by their Miniſtry (as many
Tit. 1. 10, of the *Cretian*'s did not by *Titus*'s;) was the
11, 12. fault think you *in their not being ſent*?

Par. No ſure.

Min. Do you ſuppoſe *T. E.* himſelf could be ignorant of a truth ſo obvious?

Par. Methinks he ſhould not.

Min. What then ſhould he mean by ſaying, *We ſend one another*, and by *that common experience*, which (he ſays) *ſhews that we are Miniſters of Man's making*?

Par. What can he mean by it, but your going to the Biſhop for Orders, as common experience ſhews you do?

Min. Truly his words ſtand very fair for this meaning; and therefore not only you, but doubtleſs his whole Fraternity, and many others do ſo take it, and through ignorance may be corrupted by it, and made to believe, We are not *ſent by God*, becauſe ordained by the Miniſtry of Men.

Par.

Par. Indeed I cannot deny but this paſſage brought me under ſome ſcruples, till you gave me this ſatisfaction.

Min. If *T. E.* could not be ignorant in ſo plain a Caſe, what can be his deſign here? Whatever a Man pretends to mean by any of his expreſſions, yet to ſet them down in ſuch terms as will impoſe upon vulgar Readers, and engage them in error, can ſurely be no upright dealing.

Par. No, how ſhould it? *But if* (ſays he, ſpeaking ſtill of the Miniſters of *England*) *they miniſtred by the command of God, they would do it as of the ability which God giveth; but this Divine Ability they rely not on, nor indeed expect; but School-learning, and humane Ability acquired by ſtudy and much reading, theſe they truſt to, theſe they depend on*, &c. p. 7.

Min. Whether this impudent charge againſt a whole Order of Reverend Divines be more foul or falſe, is beyond my skill to determine; while ſo great a number of them have by their humility and devotion made the contrary apparent. I am ſure he can charge no ſuch thing upon the Doctrine of our Church. Where do's he find any ſuch ſelf-confidence taught or encouraged in our Articles and Homilies, or practiſed in our publick and ſolemn Forms of Devotion? No where, I am ſure, but the quite contrary, *'Tis the healthful Spirit of God's grace* that we daily pray * for. And theſe are as great aſſurance, as men (whoſe lives are not openly ſcandalous) can give one another of the integrity of their hearts. This Quaker therefore

* Common Prayer-Book. Pr. for the Clergy. See the Collects for the 5. Sund. after Epiph. for the 5. Sun. after Easter. & for the 1, 9, and 19. Sund. after Trin. &c.

therefore accuſes us of a Crime viſible to God only; and thereby ſtrikes at *his* Prerogative, who alone is the *ſearcher of hearts*. But if there be any of the Clergy guilty of too great a meaſure of Confidence in their own Abilities; yet as this is beſt known to God, and hard for us to judge; ſo you are alſo to conſider, that, after they are Lawfully Ordained, it is not ſome perſonal faults of theirs, that can make void their Miniſtry, much leſs juſtifie the accuſation this Reviler brings againſt the whole Miniſtry of the Church.

And as for human Learning (which, he ſays, *we truſt to*;) Is not he himſelf a Pretender to it in his Book, and equally lyable to the ſame cenſure? But more of this in its proper place.

Par. But he tells us of *another great reaſon, why the People are not profited*, viz. *the diſagreeableneſs of the preſent Miniſtry to Divine Inſtitution*, *p.* 9. which Inſtitution, he tells us in the foregoing page, is generally urged to be the words of Chriſt to his Apoſtles, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations*, &c.

Min. It concern'd the credit of his party to leave out the later clauſe in that Commiſſion, inſtituting the holy Ordinance of Baptiſm; for had he not ſo done, he would have faln foul upon his Brethren, who moſt impiouſly reject it, contrary to the Univerſal practice of the Church in all Ages, ſince its firſt Inſtitution. But wherein do's our Miniſtry diſagree with the Divine Inſtitution?

Par. Before the Apoſtles *were to go forth to teach*

teach, they were to receive the Promiſe of the Father; and to tarry in the City of Jeruſalem, till they were endued with Power from on high p. 8.

Min. That this Promiſe related to the extraordinary effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt, is very manifeſt from the viſible effects of that effuſion, which were miraculous, and did not continue in the Church, but are actually ceaſed long ago; and therefore cannot (without preſumption) be expected in theſe latter Ages of the Church, by virtue of this, or any other promiſe in holy Scripture. But if the Quakers expect the Spirit in that manner as the Apoſtles had it, then according to the condition of that Promiſe, why *go they not to the City of Jeruſalem to receive it?* (in the mean time we ſhall be happily rid of them.) However if they lay claim to the whole Promiſe, why do they not make it evident, as the Apoſtles did, that they are *endued with Power from on high*, by working miracles, healing all diſeaſes, raiſing the dead and the like? When do theſe new Lights ſpeak with new Tongues? for according to *Ellwood*, *ſimilar cauſes ſhould have ſimilar effects.* But for as much as the contrary is evident, that the Quakers are not endued with this Power, with what confidence can they lay claim to this Promiſe?

Par. You told me that *the ſtrong grown Chriſtian meaſures the goodneſs of the Miniſtry from its tendency to Conſcentious obedience, that is, the performance of all duty in its latitude, both to God, to man and to our ſelves. Now if the per-*

formance of all duty to God, to man and our selves be the tendency of a good Ministry; how can that Ministry be good, which denies that all duty to God, to man and our selves can be performed in this life? p. 10.

Min. The words immediately subjoyn'd do show, that by [*latitude*] there, I meant not the Perfection of an unsinning State, but the Universality of our Obedience to God and Man together with our selves (as it there follows) that is; a sincere respect to all the Commandments of God, which *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth* were commended for, *Luk.* 1. 6. Though *Zacharias'* his imperfection was plainly discover'd in *ver.* 20, 22. Where you may read, he was struck dumb for his unbelief: but more of this subject when we come to his Chapter of Perfection.

Par. But he tells us, *the people may plainly see the reason of their not-profiting under your Ministry, because it designs to seat the Religion even of the grown Christian in the rational Powers*, p. 12.

Min. The rational Powers are the Understanding and the Will (as any smatterer in ordi-learning could inform him;) For these are they which distinguish a man from a beast: And Religion being the most Rational thing, where can it be more properly seated than in the rational Powers? That Religion which is not seated there, is but *a zeal without knowledg*, such as seduced the *Jews* to reject *Christ* and the *Samaritans to worship they knew not what.* So that *Ellwood's* Religion (it seems by his own confession) hath no seat in his understanding.

derſtanding. Here he has diſcover'd the true ground of the Fanaticiſm of himſelf and his party, and has ſhew'd in this frantick paſſage of his, that whoever will be a right Quaker muſt in the concerns of Religion lay aſide his Underſtanding, Reaſon, Wits and Judgment.

Rational Arguments are the proper *Mediums* by which the word of God works upon our Wills and Affections. Therefore ſaith God by his Prophet *Iſa.* 1. 18. *come let us Reaſon together*; and the Apoſtle prays *Phil.* 1. 13. that the *Philippians love may abound more and more in all Judgment*; and Chriſt ſaith *Joh.* 17. 3. *this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.*

Par. But take his reaſon, *The people of God* (ſays he) *in Ages paſt had their Religion ſeated in their hearts*; and this he proves from the good Ground in the Parable of the ſower, which by our Saviour is delared to be Them, *which* (*not in a wiſe and knowing head, not in the rational powers, as you ſpeak, but*) *in an honeſt and good heart having heard the word keep it.* ibid. Luke 8. 15.

Min. The Quaker here has brought an inſtance directly againſt himſelf: For by [*honeſt heart*] in that Parable is not meant the Paſſions and ſenſible Conſolations, which is plain from *verſ.* 13. where 'tis ſaid, ſome *received the word with Joy*, and *wanting root in time of temptation fell away*. Therefore the Heart being there diſtinguiſht from the lower Faculties, muſt conſequently be meant of the Higher, that is, the

rational Powers, acted by mature Deliberation, constant resolution and sincere endeavours. Through the ignorance of this, both good men and bad have oft mistaken their Condition and estate towards God, good men being sometimes discourag'd for the want of these Consolations, and bad men by the strange raptures of these fanciful joys commonly encouraging themselves with a false conceit of being in the Truth and a good estate; and therefore may be truly resembled to *Isaiah's* hungry man, *who dreameth he eateth, but he awaketh and his soul is empty. Isa.* 29. 8. which place do I never read, but it puts me in mind of the Quakers, as a true Emblem of them.

Par. But he tells us, *that the Prophet David speaking of the Righteous, saith, that the Law of his God is in his Heart.* p. 13.

Min. Where said I any thing to import the contrary? But then do's not the same *David* say, *give me understanding, and I shall keep thy Law?* And did not *Solomon* beg of God a *wise and understanding heart?* When the Scriptures speak of the *heart* with a relation to Religion, they mean the Spirit, the inward man, the rational Soul; and therefore are far from setting it in opposition to the rational Powers, which are the faculties of it, and in which the very nature of the reasonable soul consists. *Men of understanding, in Job,* 34. 10. are in the Hebrew tongue (and accordingly noted in the margin) * *Men of heart: Mercerus* upon the place gives this reason, * *because the heart is the seat of wisdom.* In *Prov.* 6. 32. *He lacketh understanding,*

*Ps.*119.34. *1 King.*3.9

* *Viri cordati.*

* *Quia cor est Sedes Sapientiæ. Mer.*

ſtanding, is in ſome Readings, * *He lacketh Heart.* You know the decree againſt *Nebuchadnezzar. Dan.* 4. 16. *Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beaſt's heart be given to him*: Now do you ſuppoſe it was the real heart of an Ox, or Aſs, or of any other brute, that was given to him? *No*; *heart* there ſignified his rational Powers, the uſe of which he was to be deprived of. And this is evident from *ver.* 34. *And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lift up mine eyes to Heaven, and mine underſtanding return'd to me*

* *Caret vel deficit codex.*

I wiſh the Quaker be true at heart himſelf; for I can hardly believe him ſuch an *Ignaro*, as here he makes himſelf; And 'tis well, if his deſign be not the advancing ſome other intereſt than that of Quakeriſm; And I wiſh thoſe miſerable deluded people, whoſe true good only (as the Searcher of all hearts knows) engaged me in this Controverſy, may ſeriouſly conſider of it.

Par. His next cauſe, why the people are not profited by your Miniſtry, *is the evil lives of Miniſters.* p. 14.

Min. Here moſt injuriouſly and craftily do's he paſs by, what he might have found in my book ſufficient to convince (if not him, yet) any ſober man. Where I *aſſert, that the efficacy of the Divine Ordinances depends not on the worthineſs of the Miniſter*; *Friendly Conference*, p. 14, *but upon the Power of God*, p. 15. that is, upon his bleſſing and grace, *that the excellency of the Power* (as the Apoſtle hath it) *may be of God, and not of us.* And why did he paſs by that note I made of St. *Paul's* rejoycing, *that Chriſt was*

preacht. tho' it were from a principle of *ſtrife and envy*? And if no benefit could come to the people by ſuch mens doctrines, what ground had the Apoſtle to rejoyce? Seeing mens reſpective duties to God and their Neighbours are taught them from the Pulpit, why takes he not notice of that unanſwerable Appeal I make to their Conſciences in theſe words? *Will you tell the great Judg at the Grat day, that your non proficiency was occaſioned by the ſcandalous life of your Miniſter? Or will an impudent upbraiding your Miniſter with his faults excuſe you in the neglect of your duty?* Conference p. 16. Now judg whether ever this Quaker deſign'd a ſober and honeſt Anſwer to my book, as in the fear of God, when not only here, but all along, he paſſes by what is moſt conſiderable, and wherein the ſtrength of my Argument lies. At this rate he might eaſily anſwer any book whatſoever.

Par. I obſerve that he ſpeaks of Miniſters (as you ſay) Indefinitly; and therefore cannot tell whether he means *All*, or *ſome*; for he do's not explain himſelf, as you uſed to do.

Min. Then may you take notice of a Jeſuitical trick of this Quaker's (frequently uſed by him) to play *faſt* and looſe, in ſuch ſhifting and ambiguous terms. If he mean that *ſome* Miniſters only are ſcandalous; why had he not the honeſty to expreſs it, to free the innocent? But then I ſuppoſe, he foreſaw that his Argument would have been hiſſ'd at as ridiculous and impertinent, in accuſing the Miniſtry it ſelf, and denying its efficacy meerly for the Perſonal

nal failings of *some* Ministers, as if Judas's faults had made void the doctrine both of himself and his fellow Apostles: On the other side, if to avoid this absurdity he purposely orders his discourse, that ignorant people may believe *All* Ministers are scandalous, this is after the rate of his modesty, and that which (blessed be God) the world knows to be a foul and malicious slander.

Par. You told me that in a settled national Ministry, consisting of great numbers in holy Orders, it cannot be expected, but that some men for a corrupt interest will intrude themselves into those sacred Offices; which is not to be charged upon their Function, seeing there was a *Judas* among the chosen Twelve: From hence *T. E.* infers that you *palliate and extenuate the crime.* p. 15.

Min. Whose crime? that of the scandalous Ministers? Will any man endued with common sence say that the import of that passage was to palliate or cloak their Crimes, when it contains a relation of so great a Crime as that of *Intruding for a corrupt interest into Sacred Offices?* No; Any one (that is not blind) may see that there I am doing quite another thing, that is, excusing the Church and Government from the blame of such an inconveniency, as indeed is unavoidable.

Par. But he wonders that you should say *these scandalous Ministers should intrude themselves; seeing all men that know any thing of them, know that according to the Constitution of your Government, none can intrude themselves*

into the Ministry, but must be admitted and have letters of Induction from the Bishop, p. 16.

Min. That there is due care taken to prevent scandalous men from intruding into the Ministry, is as freely confest by me, as it is truly intimated by this Quaker (to the honour of our Church) tho' against his will; yet as the Church may unavoidably and unblamably receive some into her outward visible Communion, who afterwards may prove Apostates; So may she, when all is done, as unavoidably admit some men into holy Orders, who may afterwards prove Hypocrites. For whereas Christ's Government of his Church is partly visible and partly invisible; His invisible Government of the Souls of men, being that which he exerciseth by his Grace and holy Spirit, is his own immediate work, because he only is the Searcher of hearts. His outward Government of his Church is that which he exerciseth by subordinate Ministers and Pastors; who, not seeing mens hearts, can act only according to that outward Polity which he has settled in his Church; and consequently the Bishops in admitting Ministers can and are obliged only to act by prudential rules of Probation, following the Apostolical directions in 2 *Tim.* 3. and *Tit.* 1. according to the best of their knowledg and conscience. Now if any so ordain'd prove Hypocrites (as they may after the severest inspection;) Yet are they regularly received, and duly ordained, and therefore true Ministers according to Christ's own Institution; the Church having herein done her utmost, and

all

all that God requires in this outward Administration: And the Gospel preached by them, being not *theirs*, but God's, and his blessing upon his own Ordinance, are sufficient to convert and save the souls of men; tho' these, while they preach to others, may themselves become Castaways. 1 *Cor.* 9. 27.

To say that upon our admission *we must have letters of Induction from the Bishop*, is a gross mistake; For *letters of Induction* are given by the Arch-Deacon; and the intent of them is not to certify our Ordination, but only to give us possession of our Benefices.

Par. But he speaks cautiously, and adds [*as I think they term them.*] ibid.

Min. He is fain very flat on a sudden. Is his confidence come to *I think?* Here he either dissembles his ignorance, or not; If he dissemble, (let his design be what it will, for which he do's it;) who is the hypocrite then? If he do not dissemble, but is truly as ignorant as he seems to be; how is such a man qualified to censure the constitution of a Church?

Par. Now then the question (he says) *naturally arises, Why would the Bishop admit such hypocrites into such sacred Offices?* ibid.

Min. The answer is naturally follows (in his own words;) *Why? He knew them not to be such*, ibid. Which is indeed an answer unanswerable.

Par. But then, alas! may, the people well say, we are now in worse case then before; for how shall we be assured, they are not most of them such? Here they are all at a loss. ibid.

Min.

Min. Why ſhould not ſuch Miniſters (whoſe lives are free from ſcandal) be thought ſincere good men, rather than Hypocrites, ſeeing *Charity* (as himſelf confeſſes p. 23.) *uſeth to think the beſt*? Thefore you may diſcover here an unchriſtian artifice and wheedle of this Quaker's, to bring the People into a prophane contempt of their Paſtors, and to make them ſuſpect the moſt Pious Clergy-man for an Hypocrite.

Neither *are the people at a loſs*, tho' the Miniſter were an Hypocrite; while (as hath been proved) the efficacy of God's word depends upon his own bleſſing, &c. and not upon the Miniſter's merit.

By this Argument of his the Church of God ever was and will *be at a loſs*, unleſs the ſincerity of her Teachers were made known by Revelation: Therefore are not the Quakers themſelves all at a loſs? For what aſſurance have they of the ſincerity of any of their Speakers, who may have drifts and deſigns much different from what they pretend to? It's well known that Jeſuits have perſonated Quakers, and have been Speakers in their Meetings. Dr. *Good** tells us that it's upon record at *Briſtol*, that two Franciſcans gave notice of the coming of Quakeriſm into that City; and that himſelf heard a Popiſh Prieſt brag, that he had been a Speaker in their meetings. Now who is at a loſs here? Not that the Emiſſaries of *Rome* care more for the Quakers, than other Sectaries, among whom they trade and lurk; but by this wicked craft, they carry on their buſineſs,

Dr. *Good's* Dialog. p. 9. 8.

buſineſs, which is to undermine the Proteſtant Religion, and this excellently conſtituted Church (the grand object of their Envy,) by throwing a bone of Diviſion, and raiſing Enemies in the bowels of her; well knowing that an Army is more effectually deſtroyed by a Mutiny among themſelves, than by the fiercer aſſaults of a foreign Enemy. So indeed do's Religion ſuffer more by ſeparation and Diviſions among the Profeſſors of it, than by the oppoſition of the very Infidels. I pray God this may be ſeriouſly conſider'd by all good men, to avoid all ſchiſmatical meetings; and by the Quakers themſelves, to be at length convinc'd, whoſe journey-men they are.

Par. Next he blames you for ſaying, that by *fruits Math*, 7. 16. is not *meant the outward Converſation of falſe Prophets, but the ill conſequences of their Doctrines*, p. 16. 17.

Min. It's true, I both ſaid it, and prov'd it: And why takes he no notice of any of my Arguments, which I ſuppoſe, he would not have paſſ'd by, had he known how to have anſwer'd them? Did I not prove my aſſertion from the deceits of Hypocriſy, and the outward ſanctity of ſome Hereticks, whom I mentioned, and *the Sheeps clothing* (the guiſe of innocency) mention'd in the text it ſelf? Look into my book again, and judg whether *Ellwood* have dealt ingennouſly with me. I ſhall only add thus much, that as an ill life makes an ill man; ſo 'tis falſe Doctrine that makes a falſe Prophet: And that as the outward ſhew of holineſs did not argue thoſe old hereticks true

Prophets;

Prophets; ſo neither did the ill life of *Judas* prove him a falſe Apoſtle. Hence it follows, that by mens outward Carriage we cannot diſtinguiſh between a falſe Prophet and a true. And as for the 21, 22 *and* 23 *verſes*, which he cites to prove the contrary, it's very evident that they relate to the final condemnation of falſe Prophets at the laſt day by Chriſt; and not to their diſcovery here by us.

Par. If thoſe wiſe and great learned men, who admit theſe ſcandalous Preachers, cannot by the ill conſequences of their Doctrines diſcover thoſe corrupt intereſts for which they do intrude themſelves, how alas! ſhould the ignorant vulgar do it? p. 17.

Min. You have ſtarted here a piece of elaborate nonſence. 'Tis indeed an hard task which he puts upon the Biſhops, and 'tis confeſt it would have required all the *wiſdom* and *learning* they have, to diſcover the corrupt intereſts of *Intruders* by the conſequences of their Doctrines before their Admiſſion, that is to ſay, before they preach any Doctrine at all.

What grave concluſions would this ſhuffler make by this prepoſterous form of putting *Conſequents* before *Antecedents*, Cart before th' Horſe! But for the prevention of their preaching falſe Doctrine after their Ordination, all ſecurity that may be is taken of them by their ſubſcriptions to ſound and orthodox Articles of Religion, according to which they are bound to preach; and there are Laws alſo to reſtrain them.

Par.

Par. Seeing *T. E.* taxes the Conſtitution of your Government, in relation to your Admiſſion into the Miniſtry, I ſhould be glad to underſtand the form and manner of it.

Min. To ſatisfy you, that all care imaginable is taken by the wiſdom and piety of our Church, to prevent the admiſſion of ſcandalous Perſons into holy orders, and to promote the honour and ends of our ſacred Function, You are to underſtand, Firſt, that there are certain times appointed for Faſting and Prayer, to invoke God, *to guide the Biſhops and Paſtors of his Flock, faithfully and wiſely to make choice of fit perſons to ſerve in the ſacred Miniſtry of his Church*; and this is according to the primitive Practice *Acts* 13. 3. Then due care is order'd to be taken for the examination of the Abilities of ſuch perſons as come to be ordain'd. Then Certificates and Teſtimonials muſt be produced concerning their Life and Converſation. When they are preſented to the Biſhop for Ordination, he in moſt ſolemn manner charges the Arch-Deacon to *take heed, whom* he *preſents &c.* And if the *people* have any thing to *object* againſt *any of them*, they are required to *come forth in the name of God*, and *to ſhew what the Crime or Impediment is.* * After Prayers, and the reading of ſuch Scriptures as are choſen for the occaſion, the Biſhop in a ſolemn ſpeech publickly *exhorts them in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to have in remembrance into how high a Dignity, and to how weighty an office and charge they are called, that is to ſay, to be Meſſengers, Watchmen, and Stewards*

Collect for Ember week.

See the Preface before the Offices for Ordination.

* That they may not miſs opportunity to do it; there are (as is well known) four ſet Sundays in the year appointed for Ordination.

ards of the Lord, &c. Then he bids them *have it printed in their remembrance, how great a treasure is committed to their charge, that is, the sheep of Christ which he bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood. And if the Church or any member thereof take any hurt, &c. by their negligence,* he reminds them *of the greatness of the fault, and the horrible punishment, which will ensue.* And that they may be excited to the greater care and diligence, they are put in mind not only of the *end* and *excellency, but of the difficulty also of their Office, as well to shew themselves dutiful and thankful unto that Lord who hath placed them in so high a dignity, as also to beware that neither they themselves offend, nor be occasion that others offend. Next he tells them, they cannot have a mind and will thereto of themselves, for that Will and* * *Ability is given of God alone, and therefore that they ought and have need to pray earnestly for his holy Spirit.* And be their Learning never so great, and their Testimonials never so credible; yet are they not to be ordain'd, till they have given engagement, in the presence of God and the Congregation, for the faithful exercise of their duty and Function, by solemn promises, and positive answers to several * Questions propounded to them by the Bishop: First, *Whether they trust, that they are inwardly moved by the holy Ghost, to take upon them that Office to serve God for the promoting his Glory, and the edifying of his Church?* to which each of them answers, *I trust so.* Then he enquires of them, Whether *they unfeignedly beleive, that the holy Scriptures*

See the form for Ordination of Priests.

* Here judg with what honesty T. E. charges the Ministry of England with denying the Divine Ability.

*See both offices for ordering Deacons & Priests.

Scriptures contain all Doctrines necessary to salvation? And (for the time to come) *Whether they are determin'd to teach nothing as necessary to salvation, but what they shall be perswaded may be proved from thence?* Whether they will be *faithful always to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, &c. Whether they will be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to God's word; and use both publick and private Exhortations as well to the sick as to the whole within their Cures,* &c. *Whether they will be diligent in prayers and reading the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledg of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?* Whether *they will be diligent to frame and fashion themselves and families according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make themselves wholsome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ?* Whether *they will maintain and set forward, as much as in them lies, quietness, peace and love among all Christian people,* &c. And lastly, Whether *they will obey the Godly admonitions of their Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, to whom is committed the charge and Government over them?* To all these they answer and promise, *They will so do, the Lord being their helper.*

Then are they by Prayer and Imposition of hands, according to the Apostolical rule and practice, ordained into their respective Functions.

Now judg what reason this bold man had to bespatter

besplatter so wise and pious a Constitution; and by Consequence to affront the King and Parliament, who have so conscientiously established it by Law. But let me advise you to read the Office it self, where you will be still more fully informed.

Par. I have given you great attention, and I must freely confess (from what you have already told me) that this form of your ordination is a most solemn, serious and pious service, far beyond what I ever knew or imagin'd of it; And now I begin to blame my self, for taking things so much upon trust, and for believing every tale that others have told me, as if this Church were an enemy to the power of Godliness: For not weighing things impartially, I became very much prejudic'd against it; and when I heard others rail, I learnt by their example to do so too.

Min. Therefore, I hope, hereafter you will be more just to examine things before you censure them; And for this end I have been so expres in particulars, lest you should neglect to read, and still go on (as many do) *to speak evil of those things which you* know not.* Here you may note, how unjust and disingenuous our Adversaries are, who designedly conceal the excellency of our Constitution, while they exasperate ignorant people against it. And I hope hereafter you will beware of them.

Jude 10.

Par. Your counsel is very reasonable; only I am thinking it will be said, that the faults of scandalous Ministers are the more aggravated by their walking contrary to such principles and engagements.

Min.

Min. The Sin of these men will lie at their own doors. I am not justifying any such; but or Mother the Church of England, from whom, you see, they learn no such thing. And though there be *some* bad, (as there ever were, and will be in the purest Churches, after the greatest care is taken,) yet does it detract nothing at all from the honour of those other of the Clergy, who give all faithful diligence to live up to their excellent Principles, and to Act according to their Promises and Engagements.

Par. Whereas you affirmed to me, *that they who make the Efficacy of the divine Ordinances to depend on the Worthiness of the Persons concerned in them, are worse than the Papists, and contrary to the Antient Fathers*: *The Reason*, T. E. tells us, *is obvious, the Papists and you jump together, and as with one voice endeavour to subject the people to the Clergy, how corrupt how scandalous soever.* p. 17. Fr. Conf. p. 14.

Min. Then may you see, how dishonestly this Quaker shuffles in words of his own, to pervert mine; the drift of my discourse being there to subject the people to the divine Ordinances. But why do's he pass by the antient Fathers, who were no Papists, and yet generally* held the aboveſaid Doctrines, and yet by the very Arguments which this Quaker oppoſes? For our part, we expect no other subjection from the people, but what God himself has for their own good been pleased to command, and make their duty.

So far as his objection concerns scandalous

*St. Aug. de doctr. Christiana l. 4. c 27. And de Serm. Dom in Monte l. 2. c. 37. And Contra Epistol. Parmen. l. 2. & elsewhere St. Chrysost. by Theophyl. on Mat. 23. 2.

Miniſters, I ſhall have further occaſion to ſpeak of it hereafter. But if this be all the Quakers have to ſay againſt Obedience due to their lawful Paſtors; how will this juſtify their Diſobedience to, and ſeparation from the good as well as bad?

Par. He continues the diſcourſe, and laments the condition of the people in theſe words, *Alas poor people! miſerably enthrall'd to their own ſervants, whom good or bad they muſt keep*, &c. p. 18. And he makes this note in the margin, *Miniſter a ſervant.*

Min. If one would believe the Quaker here, he's full of pity to the people; but I am ſure he's much more full of miſtakes, (and Charity muſt be mightily ſtretch'd to excuſe them from being *wilful.*) you are therefore to conſider, that there is a twofold notion of Service: There is a *ſervice of Subjection*, and there's a *Service of Love and Friendſhip.* To the firſt the Apoſtle has reference, in that Exhortation *Col.* 3. 22. *Servants, obey in all things your Maſters, &c.* To the ſecond, he refers, in that other Exhortation *Gal.* 5. 13. — *by love ſerve one another.* In this latter notion of it, viz. in Acts of kindneſs, we are ready with St. Paul to preach our ſelves the peoples *ſervants for Jeſus's ſake*; For in this ſence, that is, in the offices of Love, a Superior may not improperly be ſaid to ſerve his Inferior, as that great Apoſtle ſhewd himſelf ready to do.

In the firſt notion, it implies Dominion and Authority in thoſe whom we ſerve, and a Power to command and controul; and conſequently requires

requires ſubjection and Obedience in him that ſerveth. And in this notion alſo a *Miniſter is a ſervant*, but then 'tis to him whoſe Miniſter he is: A Miniſter of State is a ſervant, but it is to the Prince that employs him; So a Miniſter of Religion is a ſervant, yet not to the People, but to God whoſe Embaſſador he is. The Apoſtles were Miniſters, and did the people think them *their ſervants?* The Church is compared to an Army; and are the Leaders and Officers in an Army, Servants to the common Soldiers? Miniſters are by their Office to *direct and rebuke*; and if they were *ſervants* to the people, would it become them ſo to do? Angels are Miniſtring Spirits, and are by God appointed to ſerve the neceſſities of the Church; This do's not ſuppoſe that they are our *ſervants*, to be controuled by us.

They are Miniſters of God, Miniſters of Chriſt, not of the people. See Mede's Diſc. on 1 Cor. 4. 1.

But the Quakers methinks ſhould be more modeſt than to expect from the Clergy a ſervice of Subjection to the people, While (if the Author of the *ſpirit of the Hat* may be truſted) *Fox* and others of them arrogating to themſelves the Miniſterial Function and Power, *do cruſh the tender ones*; as he terms it, p. 12.

However you ſee the Arts, T. E. and ſuch as he, make uſe of to encourage the people to contemn their lawful Teachers; and in the mean time, as ſcrupulous as the Quakers are to call any man *Maſter*, you ſee how they take upon them to be really *ſo* themſelves. Do's not this piece of Ambition directly oppoſe the plain doctrine of holy Scripture, which ſays concerning the relation of Miniſters to the peo-

ple, that *They are over them in the Lord*, 1 *Thess.* 5. 12. and so commands them to *esteem them very highly. v.* 13. And again, that *They have the rule over them Heb.* 13. 17. and commands them *to obey them, and submit themselves*, &c. And calls them elsewhere * *Teachers, Fathers* and *Pastors?* But the Quakers it seems, are for inverting this Doctrine, and making the Hearer and learner a Master over his Teacher, a Son over the Father, and the Flock over their Shepherd.

* 2 *Tim.* 2. 11. *Eph.* 4. 11. 1 *Cor.* 4 15

Now therefore to retort his own words, p. 29. *What I pray do's this bespeak, but pride and arrogance?* And as a little before, *Is it the humble, meek, gentle Spirit of Jesus? or the haughty proud exalted Spirit of Lucifer?*

Here you see the ill Consequences of his Doctrine; And by applying the rule of our Saviour, you may know, who he is by his *fruits*, that is to say, a false Prophet.

Par. Though I have great ground to suspect a man for a Fornicator, though I know him to be Covetous, though I fear he is an Idolater, &c. must I notwithstanding (says he) *acknowledg this man to be a Minister of Christ, and have recourse to him for teaching, &c. God forbid. p.* 19.

Min. This Quaker, lest he should not have enough against the Clergy positively to accuse them of, judges it needful here to supply that defect with *fears* and *suspitions*. Though both the Proverb and right Reason affirm, that *Suspition is no proof*; yet observe here, that even *Fears and suspitions* are by this Quaker made warrantable grounds, both for Censure and separation

tion. But I pray, consider, what confusions and distractions this principle tends to, how ready an Expedient it is to pick a hole in the Coat of the best man living, to incense the vulgar, and justify any villainous enterprize. What jealousies will not malice and Prejudice suggest, of the Holiest man on earth? The suggestion of *fears* and *jealousies* was the first artifice, that was used to foment the late Rebellion, and to hasten those fatal effects of it both in Church and State, which this Nation since has felt. The same Trade, you see, is still driven on by this Incendiary and his Fellows, in order to the same Effects, from which God deliver this Church and Nation.

Par. You told me, *that the Scribes and Pharisees were got into Moses's Chair*, &c. *Here first* (says he) *it may be worth our noting, that the Scribes and Pharisees were got into Moses's Chair, not into Aaron's: Now Moses was the Civil Magistrate, the Judg or Ruler; But Aaron was more properly the Priest, p.* 19. *Mat.* 23. 2.

Min. For the right understanding of this text, We must consider What *Moses's Chair* imports; and Who the *Scribes and Pharisees* were. Moses was not only a Civil Magistrate, but a Prophet, and type of Christ *Deut.* 18. 15. And we are to cosider him here, not as a *Magistrate*, but as a *Prophet*. Him the *Jews* ever esteemed, as cheif of their *Doctors*. They call him *Master*, to this day; and glory not a little in his Discipleship: And indeed the Scriptures do artribute to him a higher mode of Prophecy than ordinary. Now the great and principal *Joh.* 9 23, 29. *Deut.* 18. 15. and 34. 10. *Num.* 12. 6, 7, 8.

work of a *Prophet*, was to teach and instruct the people: This is evident from the Scriptures 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. False Prophets and false Teachers do there explain one another. And *Prophesying* is put for Expounding and teaching the will of God, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. *and* 14. 1, 3. And he that expoundeth and declareth another's mind and meaning is called his Prophet, *Exod.* 7. 1, 4, 16: And Christ's great work in the exercise of his Prophetical Office, was to teach the people and to reveal his Father's will. We may therefore safely conclude, that *Moses's Chair*, is the Chair of Doctrine; For it was the custom of those times for Teachers to *sit*, while they taught; as several of the *Jewish* Doctors, and also the antient Commentaries under St. Ambrose's name on 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 30. do inform us. In conformity to this Custom Christ himself taught *sitting*; and the antient Philosophers did the same, as Grotius noteth upon the place, where he quoteth Seneca calling them *Cathedrarii*, that is, *Chairmen.*

That *Moses's Chair* is thus to be taken, will further appear from the Persons sitting in it. Christ's discourse is not concerning *Judges and Magistrates*, but *Teachers*, as appears from *ver.* 4. where we read, *They bound heavy burthens &c.* that is expounded the Law with intolerable strictness by adding their Traditions to it; see *Acts* 15. 10, 28. and accordingly the *Jews* called a thing forbidden by the Doctors *Ligatum*, viz. a thing bound; and a thing permitted *Solutum* or loosed. Christ mentions

See ver. 9, 10, &c.

mentions none, but *Scribes and Phariſees*, excluding Sadducees, who yet were members of their Sanhedrins, as well as the other. And if he had ſpoken concerning their Sanhedrins, the Prieſts would no doubt, have been mention'd eſpecially the high Prieſt, who was a Chief member of them in our Saviour's time. Now that the Scribes here mention'd did ſucceed the Prophets in their office and Employment, is clear from the Scripture. *Behold* (ſays our Saviour) *I ſend you Prophets, Wiſemen and Scribes*, *Mat.* 23. 34. Where the one do's expound the other. In 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. *Wiſe-men* and *Scribes* are conjoyn'd; For *ſuch* as were educated in the Learning and wiſdom of the Law, and profeſſed it, were called Scribes. *Ezra* is called a Scribe, *ch.* 7. 12. to which ſenſe Chriſt alludeth *Mat.* 13. 52. In antient times many were educated in Schools and Colledges to be Prophets; But when the gift of Propheſy ceaſed among that people, then they remained *Scribes* only; accordingly Maimonides ſays, that the Reaſon why Baruch was ſo diſcontented, was becauſe he had ſpent ſo much time under Jeremiah, to obtain the gift of Propheſy, yet was conſtrain'd to go without it: So that he was called *Baruch the Scribe* only. Wherefore the true notion of *Scribes* is this, They were Students, Learned men, and Teachers * of the Law to the People, as the Prophets were of old, but without the gift of Propheſy; Succeeding them in their Office, but not in their extraordinary Miſſion and Supernatural Endowments: Hence our Lord ſays, that *they ſate in Moſes's ſeat.*

* Νομοδιδάσκαλοι. *Luk* 5. 17.

work of a *Prophet*, was to teach and inſtruct the people: This is evident from the Scripture; 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. Falſe Prophets and falſe Teachers do there explain one another. And *Prophe-ſying* is put for Expounding and teaching the will of God, 1 *Cor.* 13. 2. *and* 14. 1, 3. And he that expoundeth and declareth another's mind and meaning is called his Prophet, *Exod.* 7. 1, 4, 16: And Chriſt's great work in the exerciſe of his Prophetical Office, was to teach the people and to reveal his Father's will. We may therefore ſafely conclude, that *Moſes's Chair*, is the Chair of Doctrine; For it was the cuſtom of thoſe times for Teachers to *ſit*, while they taught; as ſeveral of the *Jewiſh* Doctors, and alſo the antient Commentaries under St. Ambroſe's name on 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 30. do inform us. In conformity to this Cuſtom Chriſt himſelf taught *ſitting*; and the antient Philoſophers did the ſame, as Grotius noteth upon the place, where he quoteth Seneca calling them *Cathedrarii*, that is, *Chairmen.*

That *Moſes's Chair* is thus to be taken, will further appear from the Perſons ſitting in it. Chriſt's diſcourſe is not concerning *Judges and Magiſtrates*, but *Teachers*, as appears from *ver.* 4. where we read, *They bound heavy burthens &c.* that is expounded the Law with intolerable ſtrictneſs by adding their Traditions to it; ſee *Acts* 15. 10, 28. and accordingly the *Jews* called a thing forbidden by the Doctors *Ligatum*, viz. a thing bound; and a thing permitted *Solutum* or looſed. Chriſt mentions

See ver. 9, 10, &c.

mentions none, but *Scribes and Phariſees*, excluding Sadducees, who yet were members of their Sanhedrins, as well as the other. And if he had ſpoken concerning their Sanhedrins, the Prieſts would no doubt, have been mention'd eſpecially the high Prieſt, who was a Chief member of them in our Saviour's time. Now that the Scribes here mention'd did ſucceed the Prophets in their office and Employment, is clear from the Scripture. *Behold* (ſays our Saviour) *I ſend you Prophets, Wiſemen and Scribes*, *Mat.* 23. 34. Where the one do's expound the other. In 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. *Wiſe-men* and *Scribes* are conjoyn'd; For *ſuch* as were educated in the Learning and wiſdom of the Law, and profeſſed it, were called Scribes. *Ezra* is called a Scribe, *ch.* 7. 12. to which ſenſe Chriſt alludeth *Mat.* 13. 52. In antient times many were educated in Schools and Colledges to be Prophets; But when the gift of Propheſy ceaſed among that people, then they remained *Scribes* only; accordingly Maimonides ſays, that the Reaſon why Baruch was ſo diſcontented, was becauſe he had ſpent ſo much time under Jeremiah, to obtain the gift of Propheſy, yet was conſtrain'd to go without it: So that he was called *Baruch the Scribe* only. Wherefore the true notion of *Scribes* is this, They were Students, Learned men, and Teachers * of the Law to the People, as the Prophets were of old, but without the gift of Prophecy; Succeeding them in their Office, but not in their extraordinary Miſſion and Supernatural Endowments: Hence our Lord ſays, that *they ſate in Moſes's ſeat.*

* Νομοδιδάσκαλοι Luk 5. 17.

As for the word [*Phariſees*,] that denoteth their Sect, and way of Religion only, moſt of the Scribes being of that ſect as is probable, becauſe it was ſo much in vogue with the people. —— From this Scripture thus explain'd it will follow.

1. That Perſons without an Extraordinary miſſion, and Supernatural Endowments, may be *true Succeſſors* of them that had both, as the Scribes were of the ancient Prophets.

2. That men may be God's Officers, though they have not that *Immediate* miſſion from him; For if the Scribes were not God's Officers, they did not ſit in Moſes's Chair, in Chriſt's ſence; This is ſo obvious, that even Heathen Magiſtrates are called *God's Miniſters*, *Rom.* 13. 4.

*by virtue of their Office.

3. That whatever Such as have the Office and Authority to Teach, (tho' bad men) do teach, **jure Cathedræ*, (as Grotius expreſſes it) keeping themſelves within the Sphere of their Authority, They ought to be obeyed in.

By an eternal document I mean a ſtanding rule in the Church.

Par. You ſaid that our Saviour hath given the people an *Eternal Document*, when ſuch Teachers as live not anſwerably to their Doctrine fall to their ſhare. An *eternal Document*! *What's that?* p. 20.

Min. I told you in our Saviour's own words, *Whatſoever they bad them to obſerve, that to obſerve and do, but not to do after their works.* *Mat.* 23. 3.

Par. Nay hold there (ſays he) *we have had too much of that already; England hath not yet forgot, ſince the Scribes and Phariſees of Rome ſate in the Chair here*, &c. ibid

Min.

Min. Had it been a *Turk*, *Jew*, or profeſt *Atheiſt*, that had accoſted me with this reply, I ſhould have receiv'd it without any ſurprize at all; But ſeeing this Quaker pretends to Chriſtianity, is it not ſtrange that He ſhould fall foul upon Chriſt himſelf? Had it been a Document of mine own framing (though never ſo reaſonable;) I ſhould not have wonder'd to ſee him exerciſe his Sophiſtry upon it: But it being a Document of our bleſſed Lord's, and deliver'd in no other but his own expreſs words, and in his own ſenſe; Methinks the Honour and Authority of the Author ſhould have deterr'd him from this Confidence, and perſwaded him to have been more ſparing.

How would the barbarous *Jews* have hugg'd themſelves, and how much innocency would they have pleaded, if in the days of Chriſt, they had been furniſht with this Quaker's Argument? For had it been broacht then, much louder had the *Crucifige's* rung in Pilat's ears. Might not *they* have argued at *Ellwood's* rate, Haſt not thou commanded us *to obſerve and do, whatſoever the Scribes and Phariſees bid us?* We are now ſet on by them; 'Tis they that bid us Crucify thee; Then from thy ſelf we have an authority to execute this command of theirs.

So that I muſt anſwer my Antagoniſt in *Iſaiah's* Dialect, 2 *Kings* 19. 22. *Whom haſt thou reproached and blaſphemed? and againſt whom haſt thou exalted thy voice, and lifted thine eyes on high? even againſt the Holy one of Iſrael.*

Par. I muſt confeſs that the Conſequences from

from this gloſs are very odious; therefore, I pray, give me now the true ſenſe of the text.

Min. I cannot do it better than in the words of St. *Chryſoſtom* an Author, whom this Quaker pretends to have a very good opinion of, and whoſe Authority he miſquotes againſt me with ſo much triumph. *p.* 120, *and* 188. Let us here him therefore deſcanting upon this Document by Theophilact, *The Lord ſpeaketh of thoſe, who ſit in Moſes's Chair, that is, of thoſe who teach what is in the Law; thoſe therefore who teach the Divine Law we ought to hear, tho they do it not themſelves:* Further he objects, (as *Ellwood* here) *But muſt we do all things they ſay, tho they be evil things? We anſwer,* ſays he, *Firſt that he that teacheth will hardly be ſo audacious as ever to exhort to things directly evil. Secondly, If we grant that any one ſhould exhort to evil life, then he ſpeaks not from Moſes's Chair, nor out of the Law.* And this I hope the Quaker will grant an eternal Document, that *All* that an evil Paſtor commands us from God's Law (and by virtue of his Office,) we ought to do; This was our Saviour's ſenſe in that text, and *mine* in quoting it.

Theoph. in loc. The like expoſition we read in St. Aug. de doct. Chr. l. 4.

Par. There is one thing which I muſt not forget; He tells his Reader in theſe words, *Our Godly Martyrs (by his leave) held not this Document to be eternal, as Smithfield can amply witneſs. ibid.*

Min. This is a paſſage I muſt not brook, that he ſhould be ſo arrogant to call them *Their* Martyrs, as if the Martyrs were Quakers, and it

it were the Quakers Cauſe for which they ſuffer'd. The Crow muſt not adorn himſelf with the Peacocks feathers; nor the Quaker challenge a property where he has none at all. In honour therefore to the memory of theſe pious Souls, I ſhall (God willing) undertake to vindicate their reputation from ſo foul, ſo falſe an intimation; and ſhew,

1. How far they were from being any thing like the Quakers, or in the leaſt inclinable to them.

2. That they did not oppoſe Chriſt's words (as *Ellwrod* here doth;) but held this Document to be eternal.

Firſt I hope to make it evident, that They were as contrary to the erroneous and nonſenſical tenents of the Quakers, as to thoſe of the Papiſts, by whoſe cruel hands they were murther'd. And this diſparity will appear both in their Doctrines and Manners.

Mr. *Fox* tells us, that Mr. *Rogers*, Protomartyr in Queen *Mary's* bloody Perſecution, ſpeaking of the Miniſtry, declared, that *the ſimilitude between Them and the Apoſtles, was not in the ſingular gifts of God, as doing miracles, &c. but They were like them in Doctrine, &c.* Now he being Vicar of St. Sepulchre, Prebendary of St. *Pauls*, and Divinity-Reader there, could not be admitted into the ſaid Preferments, but by taking *Oaths* and ſubſcribing to ſeveral Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions. And muſt He be put into the Calendar of the Quakers Martyrs? *Martyrology vol. 3. p. 129.*

Par. 'Tis well if you can agree upon the Perſons

Persons; For T. E. speaks of the Martyrs in general, and not here of any in particular.

Min. You say well: But what if I pitch upon *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Hooper*, *Philpot*, *Bradford* and *Taylor*?

Par. These T. E. will own to be Godly men, and worthy Martyrs. p. 305.

Min. Good.

Par. What makes you smile?

Min. *Cranmer* was Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, *Ridley* Bishop of *London*, *Latimer* Bishop of *Worcester*, *Hooper* Bishop of *Glocester*, *Philpot* Arch-Deacon of *Winchester*, *Bradford* Prebendary of *Pauls*, and Dr. *Taylor* Parson of *Hadley*: And would it not make any man smile to hear this man call those Reverend Prelats, &c. the Quakers Martyrs, who were such constant Defenders of the Protestant Religion, and of the Doctrin of the Church of England, both by their Sermons, their Pens, and their Lives? However take this by the way, that in calling them *Godly*, he justifies their Practices; and in calling them *Martyrs*, he owns the Cause for which they suffer'd; * and so by consequence makes the whole design of his Book a Contradiction to himself here. So that he has brought himself into this miserable *Dilemma* and necessity, either to reject these Godly Martyrs, or to recant his book.

* The cause makes the Martyr.

For further instance, These Martyrs, who were so learned, so well skilled in the Fathers, and so excellently grounded in the Principles of Faith and Holiness, that they confirmed them with the Sacrifice of their Lives, These very men

men were so far from concluding *all* Oaths unlawful, that as they could not be admitted into their Offices and Places, but by taking Oaths; so likewise did they administer Oaths to the subordinate Clergy, and Ecclesiastical Officers, according as the Laws, did then oblige them. These were Dispencers of both the Sacraments, were Receivers of Tithes; They never scrupled to give Civil Titles to men, nor to say [You] to a single person, as is evident from all their Conferences and Disputations; They wore * Gowns, and were in all such things as the present Clergy. Yea that very Form of Confession (in our service-Book,) against which *Elwood* writes a whole Chapter, was composed by some of these, whom he calls *their* Godly Martyrs.

* *Foxes* Martyrol vol. 3 p. 493, 503, 667. &c.

Par. I see already, that he had better never have mention'd these Godly Martyrs.

Min. He knows, what reputation they have among all Protestants, and therefore he would Gull the common people with this plausible Cheat, by endeavoring to perswade them, that these Martyrs were Patrons of *their* Cause. Therefore think it not tedious, if I give you a further account of their Principles and Practices.

Cranmer one of the Compilers of our Liturgy, was so far from abandoning the two blessed Sacraments, that he calls them the *Seals of God's promises and gifts, and also of that holy fellowship, which we have with Christ and all his members.* ibid p. 48.

Ridley another of the Compilers of our Liturgy,

Liturgy, was so constant to the Devotions of it, that Mr. *Fox* tells us, * *he constantly used the common-Prayer in his own house both Morning and Evening.* And that he, being told out of St. *Cyprian* and St. *Augustine*, that *Communion of Sacraments do's not defile a man, but consent of Deeds*, acknowledged it *to be well spoken if well understood*; *which was meant* (saith he) *of them, which suppose they are defiled, if any secret vice be either in the Ministers or in them which communicate with them. Baptism* (says he) *is given to Children*; *the Lords Supper is, and ought to be given to them that are waxen. And he tells us*, that *he wished the Bishop of Winchester, to be stiff in the defence of the Sacraments, against the detestable errors of Anabaptists.* And (that you may see his judgment of the Continuation of the Lord's Supper) he says *[*Do this, &c. Luke 22. 19.*] *was not a Commandment for a time, but to persevere to the world's end.*

* Martyrol. vol. 3. p. 432.

ibid p. 434.

ibid p. 489.

ibid p. 491.

Hooper in his Exposition on the 3*d.* Commandment tells us, that *to Swear or take an Oath before a Lawful Judge is the work also of this Commandment, and setteth forth God's Glory: for as Paul saith, All controversies are ended by the virtue of an Oath, So have we examples in Paul Rom.* 9. And in the same Exposition, he not only owns the *Holy Sacraments* (as he rightly styles them,) but he expressly calls them both *Vows* and *Oaths*; and further tells us that therein *we Swear and promise to live after God's Will and pleasure.* Pray, Consult the Preface to his Exposition on the Ten Commandments,

Commandments, and you will find how contrary his Doſcourſe is to the Quakers notion of Perfection.

Do you not remember what character T. E. gives of *Philpot?*

Par. Yes; He tells us, He *was a Godly and Learned Martyr* p. 275.

Min. Truly *Ellwood* is *ſo far* in the right, for a Godly and Learned man he was. But then let us ſee how He and the Quakers agree in their notions and principles of Religion; and what property the Quakers have in this Excellent Martyr. *Bonner* taunting him as an Anabaptiſt, and as one that denyed the Lawfulneſs of Swearing before a Judge, he replyed thus, *My Lord, I am no Anabaptiſt, I think it LAWFVLL TO SWEAR before a Competent Judge.* He being accuſed by the ſaid *Bonner*, before one of the Sheriffs of *London*, that he denyed *Baptiſm to be neceſſary to them that were born of Chriſtian Parents*; and that he denyed *Faſting and Prayer*, &c. ſmartly anſwer'd to this ſlander, *Is not your Lordſhip aſhamed to ſay before this Worſhipfull Gentleman, that I maintain theſe abominable Blaſphemies which you have rehearſed?* So that you ſee to deny the Ordinance of Baptiſm (as the Quakers do) in the judgment of the Learned *Philpot* is an *abominable Blaſphemy.* And in vindication of Infant Baptiſm He has writ a very learned Tract never to be Anſwer'd. And concerning the other Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; At a Conference with ſeveral of the Nobility, he ſaid thus, *I do proteſt to your Honours, that I think*

Martyrol vol. 3. p. 561.

ibid.

ibid. p. 606.

think as reverently of the Sacrament, as a Chriſtian man ought to do; and that I acknowledg the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt miniſtred after Chriſt's Inſtitution, to be one of the greateſt Treaſures and comforts that he left us in the earth. And being required by the Arch-Biſhop of *York* to give a definition of the Church, he gave it thus, *It is a Congregation of people diſperſed thorow the world, agreeing together in the word of God, uſing the Sacraments and all other things according to the ſame.* So then thoſe that deny the uſe of the holy Sacraments (and conſequently the Quakers, who do ſo) are, according to this Pious Martyr, no members of the Church of Chriſt.

ibid p. 556.

Martyrol v. 3. p. 576

Bradford (whom *Ellwood* ſtyles an *Eminent Martyr*, p. 275.) in a Conference with the Arch-Biſhop of *York* and the Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, would not by both their entreaties be moved to ſit in their preſence; neither would he be perſwaded to put on his Cap, till they overcame him by their great importunity. The ſame *Bradford* chargeth the Papiſts with *Sacrilege* in robbing the Laity of Chriſt's Cup in the Sacrament. Now if he were living, of how great Sacrilege would he accuſe the Quakers, who not only take away the Cup, but utterly deny both the Sacraments? And *herein* are the Quakers far worſe than the Papiſts. Again as to his Judgment of an Oath; In a certain Conference he ſays thus, *I was thrice Sworn in Cambridg, when I was admitted Maſter of Arts, when I was admitted Fellow of Pembrook Hall, and when I was there, the Viſiters came thither*

ibid p. 295.

ibid p. 298.

ibid p. 284.

and

and Sware the Univerſity, Again I was Sworn, when I enter'd into the Miniſtry, when I had a Prebend given me, and I was Sworn to ſerve the King a little before his Death. Tuſh! Herod's Oaths (quoth the Chancellor*) *a man ſhould make no Conſcience at. But, My Lord,* (ſaid *Bradford*) *theſe were no Herod's Oaths, no Unlawful Oaths, but* OATHS ACCORDING TO GOD's WORD, *as you your ſelf have well affirmed in your book De verâ obedientiâ.* Do but compare his Letters Recorded by *Fox*, with *Ellwood's* Chapter *of Confeſſion*, and ſee whether Light and Darkneſs can be more contrary. * *Steph. Gardiner.*

Taylor ſpeaking of the Common Prayer-Book, gives this character of it, *There was* (ſays he) *ſet forth by the innocent King Edward, the whole Church-Service, with great deliberation and the advice of the beſt learned men in the Realm, and Authorized by the whole Parliament, and receiv'd and publiſh'd gladly by the whole Realm, which book was never reformed but once, and yet by that one reformation it was ſo fully perfected, according to the Rules of our Chriſtian Religion in every behalf, that no Chriſtian Conſcience could be offended with any thing therein contained, I mean of that book reformed.* Martyrol vol. 3. p. 171.

And the Common Prayer-Book was the laſt Preſent he made to his Wife; and that which he uſed alſo during his inpriſonment. This may ſatisfy you, that this Godly Martyr was no Quaker. Of an Oath you may ſee his opinion, where he ſaith, *The Oath againſt the Supremacy of the Biſhop of Rome was a* LAWFULL OATH, *and ſo was the Oath made by us all* ibid p. 175. ibid p. 172.

touching the King's or Queen's Preheminence.

Par. I perceive after all this, that all those excellent men, whom he acknowledges Godly Martyrs, were of the *Church of England.*

Min. Did you ever doubt it? Surely it was never questioned, till this Quaker invaded our Right in them.

Par. But how do you prove your other Particular, that they held the afore-mention'd Document to be eternal?

Min. First you shall hear, what Latimer saith, *As long as they minister the word of God or his Sacraments, or any thing that God hath Ordained to the Salvation of Mankind, wherewith God hath promised to be present, to work with the Ministration of the same to the end of the world, They be to be heard, to be obeyed, to be honoured for God's Ordinance sake, which is Effectual and Fruitful, whatsoever the Minister is, though he be a Devil, &c.* And he cites *Origen* and *Chrysostom* as of the same opinion.

biid p. 478.

Hear also what the Learned *Philpot* saith to this Point. He being engaged in a Disputation with the Arch-Bishop of *York*, and being asked [*what the opinion of the Donatists was?*] replyed, *That they were a certain sect of men, affirming among other Heresies, that the Dignity of the Sacraments depended on the Worthiness of the Minister, so that if the Minister was Good, the Sacraments which he Ministred were available, or else not.* Here you may infer, that this tenent of *Ellwood's* in the opinion of this holy Martyr is no less than *Heresy.* And you may know too from whence both *he* and *his Brethren*

ibid p. 576.

thren had it, even from the *long since exploded* Donatists. At another Disputation with the Bishop of *Worcester* and others, He told the Bishop that *he knew Rome.* To this the Bishop answer'd, that *he was sorry that he had been there, for he supposed, the wickedness which he saw there made him do, as he did. Philpot* replyed *No, My Lord, I do not do, as I do for that cause; for I am taught otherwise by the Gospel, not altogether to refuse the Minister for his evil living, so that he bring sound Doctrine out of God's Book.* ibid p. 546.

Par. I wonder, why you take no notice of *Tindall*, whom T.E. calls a *faithful Martyr* p. 275.

Min. I shall give you two or three instances, whereby you may understand, his Principels were far from Quakerism. In a supplication to the King and Estates, he exhorts the Lords Temporal, that *they would fall before the King's Grace, and would humbly desire his Majesty to suffer it to be tryed, who of right ought to succeed,* &c. And that all the Lords Temporal *be* SWORN *thereto, &c.* Next I find this Confession of his, *We be all Sinners an hundred times greater than all that we suffer.* And in one of his Letters he gives advice, that *the Scripture may be in the Mother-Tongue, and* LEARNING *set up in the* UNIVERSITIES. Martyrol. vol. 2. f. 368. ibid.

That these Martyrs aforemention'd were Godly men, T.E. himself confesses. From which confession of his you may reasonably make this Inference, That men may be Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Arch-Deacons, Prebendaries and Parsons; may encourage University-Education; ibid p. 369.

ſons may live and die Conformable to the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church of England; may Adminiſter both the Sacraments; may hold it Robbery and Sacrilege to deprive the People of [but] a part of the Lord's Supper; may defend infant-Baptiſm; take Oaths; daily confeſs themſelves to be miſerable Sinners; may ſay [*You*] to a ſingle Perſon; give and receive Titles of Honour; may take Tithes; and (agreeably to Chriſt's Doctrine) affirm it unlawful for any man to divide the External Unity of the Church by ſeparating from that particular Congregation, whereof he is a member, for the faults or ill life of the Preacher; And yet, *even in Ellwood's judgment*, be GODLY Men. Now if theſe were *Godly Martyrs*, why muſt we be accounted Ungodly, for retaining the *ſame* Doctrins and Conſtitutions? I heartily wiſh the Quakers would be of the ſame Religion theſe good men were of; for then they would be of our Religion too; and then (but not before) I ſhould acknowledg them *Their* Martyrs.

Par. Whereas you told me, that a man is to look at the water, not at the Conduit through which it is conveyed. *Conf. p.* 15. To this he anſwers, *But if a man ſee the Conduit beſmeared with mire and dirt, will he chooſe (or is it reaſonable he ſhould be tyed) to drink the water that iſſues therefrom, &c? p.* 21.

Min. The outſide of the Conduit may be defiled, and yet the pipes and water in them may be clean. Man's evil actions do not hinder his ſpeaking well, nor doth the wickedneſs of the Sower infect the ſeed; as was determin'd

in

in an old British Council under Saint Patrick. *Splem. T. 1. p. 56.*

Par. To your instance of *Judas* he says; *he was bad enough, but will you say, that after he had transgressed and faln, he should (if he had lived) have continued in the Ministry? p. 22.*

Min. This is an idle query, far remote from our present business, started on purpose to avoid the question, which was not to enquire, whether *Judas* should have continued in his Apostleship after his horrid treason, (had not the divine Vengeance pursued him to death?) but the question was, whether *Judas* was a Good man or Bad, during the exercise of his Apostolical Function, before that Treason was committed? That he was both an Apostle and a Bad man, is * certain, and * confest by my Adversary. Therefore 'tis clear enough (what I before asserted) that an Ill man may notwithstanding be a true Minister of the Gospel. Here you may see, that I am not pleading the Cause of *Judas*, or any like him; For I wish such were ejected: But till this be fairly done by just Authority, we may not allow the people to separate from them, seeing our Saviour never caused his Disciples to separate from *Judas*, tho' he knew him and declared him to be a Devil. *Joh. 6. 70, 71.* Now that the people are not *tied* and *fetter'd* (according to T. E.'s. expression) to Ministers incorrigibly ill, but may have remedy by a Judicial way of Proceeding, appears from the *26. Article* of this Church; And to my knowledg, some accordingly have been Ejected from their Offices and Benefices.

* *Acts.* 1. 17, 18. *Joh.* 6. 7. and 13. 18.

* pag. 21, 22.

Par. As for *Nicholas* the Deacon (whom you mention'd) *his Office was to ſerve tables, to take care of the widows, &c. he was choſen to be Overſeer of the poor, &c. however it appears not, that he was a publick Preacher.* ibid.

Min. If I rightly underſtand this Quaker, the Offices of a Deacon and an overſeer of the poor are according to him one and the ſame. Then probably his next work will be to quarrel with our Magiſtrates, or rather with the Laws of the Land, that the Overſeers of the poor are not ordained into their Function by Prayer and Impoſition of hands, as the Deacons were *Acts. 6. 6.* But why might not *he* be a Preacher as well as his Collegue St. *Stephen*?

However this I muſt ask, If the Quakers plead, that his Deaconſhip did not qualify *him* for a publick Preacher, How dare *they* (men and women, every one at their pleaſure) take upon them to preach, being neither Prieſts nor Deacons? Do's not this contradict and make void their pretence of the *Spirit's Moving them?*

And whereas T. E. ſays, that neither the Scriptures nor Euſebius ſay He continued his Deaconſhip after his Defection; I anſwer, neither do they ſay he was caſt out of his Deaconſhip, which was my Adverſarie's part to have proved: but he ſaw that he could not make that out; whereupon he ſays, that it *appears not he was a publick Preacher*, concerning which I have ſaid what is ſufficient already.

But whatever the Preacher is, the people are accountable,

accountable for all the instructions they hear, concerning their respective duties both to God and man. How will *Ellwood* deny this?

Par. Ay but, (says he) *might his Parishioner well have replyed, Those discourses made little impression upon me, when I consider'd from whom they came &c. p.* 23.

Min. Ay *Indeed?* Is this the Quaker's Divinity, to say this would have been well replyed, That the Sermons of his duty to God and man made little impression upon him? No pretence, I am sure, can justify this Reply; But it's too apparent, the contrary Command of our blessed Saviour lately explained to you, has made little impression upon this Quaker, whereby the people are straitly enjoyn'd not to disobey their Teachers (tho' Scribes and Pharisees) nor to plead *their* ill life to excuse their own disobedience, (as this Quaker here encourages the people to do, having (to this end no doubt) aforehand corrupted that text, as you have heard;) but in quite opposit terms, Whatsoever they bid them concerning their said duty to God and man, that to observe and do, tho' not after their works. This Quaker in the mean time forgot that heavy sentence of our Saviour's, *Mat.* 5. 19. *Whosoever shall break one of these least Commandments, and teach men so, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is, excluded from the Priviledges of it.

I am confident, he cannot think, this Plea, which he teaches the people, will hold good at the *last Day*; For while Goodness is Goodness,

and Truth is Truth, whoever ſpeaks it; God will *then* demand an account of it from all that heard it. And whatever prophane men, and promoters of Satan's Kingdom may talk and vent at this diſtance from that Day, Yet they will *then* find *Ellwood's* Plea inſufficient to anſwer theſe Queſtions, *If you Diſcerned the actions of your Teacher to be EVIL, why then did you not avoid them? His Example did not compel you to be Bad: And if you Diſcerned his Inſtructions to be GOOD, why then did you not follow them? Why did you not conſider what they were, rather than from whom they came?* To theſe queſtions they will *then* be as ſpeechleſs, as *he* in the Goſpel, that was found without his Wedding Garment; And it will not be *Thomas Ellwood*, that will *then* be able to open their mouths.

Mat. 22. 12.

Par. You have ſaid enough to convince me both of the weakneſs and naughtineſs of this Plea, which he has taught the people, and by which they encourage themſelves to ſleight their Teachers and their Doctrine for the leaſt failing they find in them.

Min. This will neither juſtify the impiety of theſe men, nor the Separation of ſuch as have already left the Church, on that pretence of the Teacher's not following his own directions, which is as abſurd and prepoſterous, ſaith St. *Auguſtin*, * *As if a Traveller ſhould think, he muſt go back again, or leave the way, becauſe he ſaw the Mil-ſtone with its inſcription ſhewing him the way, but not moving in it at all it ſelf.*

* Hom. 50.

But there are too many that rejoyce at the faults

faults of Miniſters, where they find them; and invent and impute them, where they find them not; that they may have a pretence for their Separation. To which purpoſe rightly ſaith St. *Auguſtin* in the ſame place, *Men ſeek not ſo much with Charity whom they may Commend, in order to their Imitation; as with ill will whom they may Carp at, in order to their* [own] *Deception: Some cannot find out Good men, being ill themſelves; and others fear to find ſuch, becauſe they would ſtill be evil.*

Par. The true Miniſters were always Examples of Goodneſs, (he ſays) *but too many of theſe Miniſters are Examples of evil.* p. 24

Min. Has not the Quaker forgot himſelf here? For [*too many*] is an implicit acknowledgment, that *many* are *not* Examples of evil, and therefore after all his Exclamations may be Good men.

Par. When you cannot clear them of your own Profeſſion, (ſays he) *you fall upon the Quakers, whom if you can render as bad as your own, you think you have done ſomething, &c.* p. 24, 25.

Min. I never endeavour'd to clear thoſe of mine own Profeſſion that are *faulty*, but the *Innocent*, and to juſtify the *Profeſſion* it ſelf from unjuſt Cavils. I ever thought it a method as Ungentile, as Improper, to defend Truth by *Perſonal Reflections*. A *Zealous Turk*, and a *prophane Chriſtian* makes me think no better of *Mahometaniſm*, nor worſe of *Chriſtianity*. But ſeeing the Quakers themſelves have been the firſt *Aggreſſors* in this way of arguing, and do place ſo much of their ſtrength therein,

therein; it was proper for me, (only in general terms not naming any particular persons) and indeed I was engaged to confute it, by letting them see, how much it reflects upon their own Faction, and makes all such objections void. However, that the world may know it was no groundless intimation of mine, being thus put upon't, I desire Sir *James Whitlock's* case, as it was lately managed in Chancery, and two Books, the one call'd [*The Quakers Spritual Court*;] the other [*The Spirit of the Hat*] written by a Quaker, may be examined.

By this time, I hope, I have removed your scruples occasion'd by the Quaker's first Chapter, which in his Preface he tells his Reader, is *Offensive*. As great a truth as ever he spake; For I have sufficiently proved it so to be, that is, offensive to God, to Truth, and all Good men. But let us now proceed to the examination of his second Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of saying [You] to a single person.

Par. IN his second Chapter T. E. says, *you seem offended with their using the word [Thou] to a single person.*

Min. I only vindicate the useof [*You*] to a single person; yet must I tell him, that to take up a word or phrase (tho' lawful in it self) in contradiction to an innocent custom, and in an affected singularity as a mark of distinction from their Neighbours, this is justly offensive: And to make it a necessary duty to say [*Thou*] to a single person, and a sin to say [*You*;] when God has neither commanded the one, nor forbidden the other, this is adding to the Word of God, and is rank Superstition and Pharisaism, in enslaving the Conscience, and placing Religion in pitifull niceties; *Superstition being an impiety, which represents God so light, or so froward, as to be either pleased, or angry with things indifferent, and of no moment.* *

* *Superstitio est impietas, quâ Deum ita levem, aut iracundum quis cogitat, ut rebus nihili placari eum putet, isdemve ad iram Commoveri. Morl Enchir. Eth. l. 2.*

Par. But T. E. says, that *they lay not the stress of their Religion upon words.* p. 27.

Min. A good hearing; Then may a good man, without any violence to Religion, say as well [*You,*] as [*Thou*] to a single person. But if he spoke as he thought, why do they and he contend so much about a word, and divide the Church, and separate themselves from

from it for a thing they dare lay no *ſtreſs of Religion upon?* So that he has in thoſe words done little credit to his Cauſe, and his whole Party, in making them all Schiſmaticks.

Yet can we think, that he has here truly repreſented his own Party, or clear'd them of Superſtition, while we obſerve their ſtrict and demure uſe of words and phraſes to the enſlaving of their own Conſciences? As if to ſay, [*I thank you for your kindneſs*] or the like, were not as good ſenſe and as lawful, as to ſay, [*I receive thy love*;] Or to ſay [*Such a one is dead*] were not as pleaſing to God, as to ſay [*He is out of the body*;] Or to ſay, [*I cannot conſent to ſuch a thing*] were not as proper, and as Religious, as to ſay [*I am not free*,] which is a phraſe they have very ready to oppoſe good Laws and good Counſel.

And if you mark the Quakers, you cannot but obſerve, that in the affected uſe of their diſtinguiſhing phraſes, tones and geſtures, they really eſteem themſelves more religious than their Neighbours, whilſt indeed (if they underſtood it) they are the leſs Religious, by how they are the *more* ſuperſtitious and ſchiſmatical.

But I believe, that in many of them much of this proceeds from want of knowledge, who now (I hope) will by one of their own Teachers be at length convinc'd of their great errour in laying ſo much *ſtreſs of Religion upon words and phraſes.*

Par. You muſt be cautious how you reflect upon the Quakers for the uſe of their phraſes, ſeeing

seeing many of them are taken out of the holy Scriptures.

Min. Though the holy Scriptures ought to be remembred and frequently used in our Converse, for our mutual instruction; Yet I would not have you so ignorant and superstitious, as to think that God in revealing his will there, design'd that our duty should consist in the continual use of those very forms of speech, but in a due regard to those truths and Commands contained in them.

As for the style of the Scriptures, you are to understand, that it was ever accommodated to the particular dialect of that people to whom they were written, and therefore varied accordingly; as we find it does in the different proprieties of the *Hebrew* Tongue in the old Testament, and of the *Greek* in the new: And if this had not been observed by the Apostles in their Preaching, how could they have been understood by men of so many different Languages, as we find they spake to *Acts* 2. seeing every language has its peculiar phrases and proprieties of speech?

Therefore God's complying with those national customs of speech then, is a rule to us to do the like now; Otherwise a man would be a *Barbarian* to those he converses with.

Now the word of God is never so much abused, as when the phrases of it are plausibly used, while the sense of it is perverted and applyed to evil purposes, to maintain schism, faction and the like; and this we call *Canting*; an Instance hereof we have in Corah and his company,

company, who even in an Act of Rebellion could cry, *The Congregation is holy, and the Lord is among them*; their sin being much aggravated, by their gainsaying Authority in holy language.

Numb. 16. 3.

Par. Yet, says he, *we know there is a form of words, and we desire to keep to it.* ibid.

Min. Here is one instance (among many in his book) of this Quaker's *Canting*, in his demure and impertinent bringing in a Scripture phrase, nothing at all belonging to the subject in hand, but quite to another matter. However one thing I like well, that *found words* in the opinion of a Quaker may be contained in a *form*. But if he allude to that *form of found words*, which St. *Paul* gave to *Timothy*; That, you must know, was no such thing as a Gang of phrases, but a Creed or short Summary of Christian Religion, by the use of which he might be enabled to withstand the opposition of growing heresies. And therefore to bring in this to the subject in hand, to make the sense of these words to imply a Grammar or Dictionary to direct the Conscience in the use of words and phrases (as his brethren no doubt do understand him) is a thing which sure He, upon more serious thoughts, will be unwilling to defend, and therefore he had done faithfully to have interpreted his meaning.

2 *Tim.* 1. 13.

Dr. *Hammond in loc.*

If by *found words* he mean an entire and plain Confession of Faith, or a summary of those things that are necessary to be believed unto Salvation, I know no such thing subscribed by the body of them; for that would fix them to something

ſomething, when indeed they are yet fix'd to nothing. This miſerable defect is far remote from the uprightneſs and ingenuity of the Apoſtles, in giving their Hearers an account of their Fundamental Principles in a *ſhort Form*, to let men ſee to the bottom of their Religion. * ὑποτύπωσιν.

Tis true indeed, ſome Quakers have pretended to ſet down in their books the heads of their belief. But then, 1. No man knows whether the reſt will ſubſcribe to them, while they have been ſo different from one another even in Fundamental Points. 2. That croud of Scripture texts which they quote, has been generally ſo erroneouſly miſinterpreted and miſapplied by them, that even where they write little elſe but Scripture words, we have reaſon to ſuſpect their meaning. Therefore when you were ſo inclined to Quakeriſm, would you have turn'd to you knew not what? to a dangerous Religion you cannot ſee to the bottom of? What kind of Religion is this of the Quakers, whereof their Leaders either can not, or dare not give any entire and intelligible account? Do not theſe Teachers uſe this as a piece of Craft to reſerve to themſelves a liberty to preach what Doctrine, yea what hereſy they pleaſe? I pray God draw their Followers out of their ſnares, and grant all unſtable people Grace and Diſcretion to keep off from them and their meetings.

As for that which we and the Univerſal Church of Chriſt embrace under the name of the Apoſtles Creed, as the Mark and Badge of a Chriſtian, the Quakers tenents are ſuch as give

give us little reaſon to think they will own it: while ſome have held one Hereſy, ſome another; Some have denied the Holy Trinity, Some have pretended Equality with God: One of the Heads of 'em pretended to be the *Meſſiah*; Another of their cheif men affirmed himſelf to be the Judge of the world, and to ſee mens hearts; and has been by ſome of his Party call'd the Son of God: Others have affirmed, that Chriſt in the fleſh, and all he did and ſuffer'd was but a *Figure*, and nothing but an example; Others, if not moſt of them, think they have no need of outward Teaching, by reading, and hearing the Holy Scriptures read and applied; And that the Holy Scriptures are not the word of God; That there is no mediate Call to the Miniſtry, &c. ſo far are they degenerate from the Chriſtian Faith.* Now what fault finds T. E. with us for ſaying [You] to a ſingle Perſon?

See perfect Phariſee.

*See perfect Phariſee.

Par. I do not ſee that he blames you for putting the ſingular and plural number together, as unlawful in it ſelf; but for the *pride and flattery, which*, he ſays, *firſt put Inferiors upon paying a Plural reſpect to the ſingle Perſon of every Superior, and Superiors upon receiving and at laſt requiring it.* ibid. *and which are ſtill cheriſhed thereby.* p. 28, 29.

Min. As for the *pride and flattery* he ſpeaks of, you muſt conſider, that the beſt actions are liable to ſuch imputations; Even Almes-deeds, Faſting and Prayer in the Phariſees proceeded from vain-glory; But then did *their* pride leſſen the value of thoſe good Actions in *others*, who conſtantly

conſtantly perform'd them? or make Almsdeeds, Faſting and Prayer unlawful? And is it unlawful for an honeſt Man to uſe an innocent expreſſion of reſpect, becauſe ill Men may abuſe it to *pride and flattery*? I hope he will not ſay that thoſe, whom he owns for *Godly Martyrs*, uſed it from ſuch evil principles.

But whether, think you, is there more pride in *our uſeing it* as a teſtimony of reſpect, or *their ſawcy denying it* to Superiors, even to the King himſelf, in an affectation of ſingularity, and in oppoſition to a lawful cuſtom?

Par. Truly I know not how to clear them, but *T. E.* tells us, *that in the beſt times, and with the beſt Men* [*Thou*] *and* [*Thee*] *were inoffenſive language.* ibid.

Min. It was cuſtom that made them ſo: But what were thoſe times and Men which he calls the beſt?

Par. Thoſe under the *Common-wealth of* Rome, *before it was turn'd into an Empire.* p. 28.

Min. What? thoſe the *beſt times, and beſt men*, in the very height of Paganiſm and Idolatry? Did our Common-wealths-man here remember, that Chriſt was born and lived under the Roman Empire, and paid obedience to it? Or did he conſider that afterwards many of the Emperors themſelves proved zealous Patrons of Chriſtianity? yet did neither alter their Dialect, nor the imperial Government, as inconſiſtent with the Chriſtian Religion.

Par. I doubt he was a little inconſiderate here; but he ſays that [*You*] *to a ſingle perſon*

(with other Titles, &c.) seems to have its rise with the Roman Empire. ibid.

Min. Suppose it had, what is it the worse for that? but how do's he prove it?

Par. From Symmachus *his Epistles to the Emperors* Theodosius *and* Valentinian, *wherein his Style unto them is* Vestra æternitas. ibid.

Min. had those Epistles been written to *Julius Cæsar* the first Roman Emperor, there had been some tolerable sense in his inference; But is it not strange, that this instance of [*vestra, your*] in the Epistles to *Theodosius* and *Valentinian* should make the Custom seem to have its rise with the Roman Empire, when these Epistles were not written till near four hundred years after the Empire was begun? Has not our Wise *Quaker* here shot very wide of the mark?

Besides, those Epistles, by his own confession, were written to two Persons, *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*: And that they were written to them both together, appears in St. *Ambrose*'s answer to them; With what sense then could he say [*Thou*] or [*Thine*] to two together? So that *T. E.* brings an instance here to prove no hing, but himself ridiculous; for I thought he had disapproved only our saying [*You*] to one, not our saying [*You*] to two, unless he could twist them both into one: He says, that by a Figure I make one Man two. *p.* 46. Now let me ask, By what Figure he makes two Men one?

But had he made search, he might have found, that it was customary to use one number for another long before the Empire began.

The

The Iſhmaelitiſh Princes uſually ſpake of themſelves in the plural number. * Nay among the Romans themſelves, this Cuſtom was of a much ancienter date than their Empire: For *Terence*, who lived 100 years before it began, has this expreſſion, *Profectò neſcio quid abſente nobis turbatum eſt domi*, * that is, Truly I know not what diſturbance there has been at home in our abſence: *Phædria* ſpeaks there of himſelf in the plural number: This was uſed by *Cicero* very frequently both in his Orations, Epiſtles and his Books of Offices, as I could give variety of inſtances, if it were doubted by any: * Now *Cicero* dyed, when the Empire was ſcarce begun.

* Hæc eſt conſuetudo linguæ Iſmaeliticæ, ut Reges de ſe loquantur numero plurali. Aben. Ezra.

*Eunuch. Act 4. ſc. 3.

*See *Walkers* Particles p. 46.

Par. But he complains of hard uſage; and ſays, *how often have many been abuſed and beaten for this harmleſs word, &c.* ibid.

Min. I know not what uſage they have met withal for their incivility and rudeneſs to Authority, and for the contempt of Laws; But that any have been beaten for the uſe of the word [*Thou*] is what I never heard of: However I obſerve, that *Ellwood* all along makes it his buſineſs and ſtudy, to promote ſchiſm and miſchief, by exaſperating his Party, and heightning their prejudices againſt *us* and the *truth*, by all the idle calumnies he can invent.

Par. But he goes on; *What Spirit is that which thus rageth? Is it the humble, meek gentle Spirit of Jeſus, or the haughty, proud, exalted Spirit of Lucifer?* ibid.

Min. What Spirit (think you) is that, which is ſo far from being inoffenſive (as the Chriſtian Spirit is) that it diſturbs and diſquiets

Neighbourhoods and Societies in matters purely indifferent, and wherein *the ſtreſs of Religion do's not lye*?

I acknowledge that the Spirit of Jeſus is an humble and obliging Spirit, and ſhould be moſt truly glad to ſee the Quakers conform to it. For our Bleſſed Lord complyed with all the innocent Cuſtoms of the People among whom he lived. Did they ſtand in the Synagogues when the Scriptures were read? Chriſt did ſo too: Did they ſit when they Preached? He did the ſame: Did they eat Bread and Wine after the Paſchal Lamb? Chriſt did ſo too; though God never commanded it: Did the Jews obſerve the Feaſt of Dedication, a Feaſt of their own inſtitution? Chriſt did ſo too: Did they lye upon Beds when they ate the Paſſover? (tho' by the Original inſtitution it was to be eaten ſtanding) Chriſt conforms to the Cuſtom, and did ſo too: Nay he accommodated the two great Sacraments of his Church to their Cuſtoms; And that Prayer which he taught his Diſciples, was for the moſt part of it compiled out of the Jewiſh Liturgies. So that we have all the reaſon to conclude, that if he had lived among us, He would have ſuited himſelf to the preſent innocent Cuſtoms both in ſpeech and behaviour: For he uſed both the Jewiſh Language and their Phraſes; He uſed both the Hebraiſms and Helleniſms of thoſe times. He deliver'd his Parables in poſitive Aſſertions; a thing more exceptionable than [*You*] to a ſingle perſon. So unwilling was he to quarrel with innocent Cuſtoms, or to make innovations, where neceſſity

Whereof there are great numbers in their Talmud.

ceſſity did not compel him. All which ſhew that the Son of God was far from a Spirit of croſsneſs and contradiction, and from all Principles of ſchiſm and faction.

Par. You muſt give me leave here to put in a queſtion of my own; If Chriſt taught ſitting, and inſtituted one of his Sacraments ſitting, why do not you imitate our Saviour's poſture in the performance of thoſe ſervices?

Min. You muſt know that ſitting when he taught, and when he inſtituted and adminiſtred the Holy Eucharift, was not one and the ſame poſture; for when he taught he * ſat in a Chair, as the Jewiſh Doctors uſed to do; but his poſture at the Sacrament was **leaning* or *lying along* on one ſide; In which poſture, though he being the Lord himſelf, did in his ſtate of Humiliation, eat his Laſt Supper with his Diſciples, and gave them the freedom to do the like; yet that being contrary to our National Cuſtom, and Chriſt being now Glorified, this poſture of *leaning* or *lying along* would be very irreverent among us, in the celebration of that B. Sacrament, the great Pledge of his Love, and Memorial of his Death.

* Luk. 5. Joh. 8. 2. καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν.

* Mat. 26. 20. ἀνέκειτο.

But one thing I will take the boldneſs to affirm, That we conform more to our Saviour's example in doing as we do, then if we performed thoſe Services in Chriſts own poſture.

Par. This is ſtrange!

Min. It will not be ſo ſtrange to you, if you well weigh and conſider this truth; That Conformity to our Saviour conſiſts not in doing the ſame Natural Actions which he did, but in following the ſame Moral Rule, by which he

did those Actions: Now his Rule was to conform to all present Constitutions and Customs in themselves indifferent; And this in order to the promoting of Love and Peace: The Rule of Charity was his constant and general Rule in all his Actions; Particularly in this last instance, our Saviour did not institute a posture, but only express a compliance with a Jewish Custom: He therefore that for peace and love conforms to all present lawful Customs and Constitutions (though far different from the same natural Actions our Saviour did) most truly conforms both to the example, and the meek and gentle Spirit of Jesus.

Par. You may remember, that when I produced this Argument from the Quakers, viz. *That God* Thou'd *Adam, and Adam* Thou'd *God*; you stopt my mouth by asking, *whether the Discourse was in English?* And by saying that *if the Translators had put* [You] *instead of* [Thou;] *this shadow of an Objection had disappear'd.* He says it should have been [*not appeared*;] but this remark I pass by as inconsiderable, and nothing against your Cause: Only he has this to say against the answer you gave me, *that the Hebrew is not defective of Numbers, but hath the singular and the plural as distinct as the English; If therefore the Translators had used* [You] *for* [Thou] *instead of one objection there would have been two.* p.30.

Min. He needed not to have so gravely told us, that the Hebrew is not defective of numbers; for who knoweth not, that no Language can be without them? But by this Rabbi's good leave,

leave, neither is the Hebrew defective of Figures, especially one common both to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, called *Enallage Numeri*; by which is justified the use of the Plural Number, when the signification is singular; * of which I could produce abundance of instances out of the Holy Scriptures; Take these few; *Jud.* 12. 7. *He was buried in one of the Cities of Judah*: The Hebrew text in the Latin version is rendred word for word *Sepultus Civitatibus, &c.* buried in the Cities. So *Gen.* 3. 8. *They hid themselves among the Trees, &c.* according to the Hebrew it should be [Tree] in the singular number; hereupon *Menochius* notes, *Arbor ponitur pro* [Arbores] *per Enallagen Numeri.* Josh. 24. 19. *He is an Holy God, &c.* Where [Holy] (in the Original) is in the plural, and [God] in the singular number; for it is not unusual for Adjectives and Verbs in the Hebrew to be joyn'd with Substantives in the plural number.

* See Dr. *Ham.* on *Mat.* 27. 44.

See *Buxtorf's* Thes. Gram. linguæ sacræ. p. 422, 424, 425.

Pray consult *Job* 18. 2. where you will find *Bildad* speaking thus to *Job*, *How long will it be ere YOU make an end of words?* And *Daniel* speaks thus (*Dan.* 2. 36.) *This is the Dream and WE will tell the interpretation thereof*: So that you see in these instances (long enough before the Roman Empire I wot) that both a good man was spoken to, and a good man spake of himself in the plural number: Holy *Daniel* of himself says [*We*;] and upright *Job* receives the Title [*You*] when he was far from being an object of *flattery*, and *Bildad* a miserable comforter driving on a quite con-

did those Actions: Now his Rule was to conform to all present Constitutions and Customs in themselves indifferent; And this in order to the promoting of Love and Peace: The Rule of Charity was his constant and general Rule in all his Actions; Particularly in this last instance, our Saviour did not institute a posture, but only express a compliance with a Jewish Custom: He therefore that for peace and love conforms to all present lawful Customs and Constitutions (though far different from the same natural Actions our Saviour did) most truly conforms both to the example, and the meek and gentle Spirit of Jesus.

Par. You may remember, that when I produced this Argument from the Quakers, viz. *That God* Thou'd *Adam, and Adam* Thou'd *God*; you stopt my mouth by asking, *whether the Discourse was in English?* And by saying that *if the Translators had put* [You] *instead of* [Thou;] *this shadow of an Objection had disappear'd.* He says it should have been [*not appeared*;] but this remark I pass by as inconsiderable, and nothing against your Cause: Only he has this to say against the answer you gave me, *that the Hebrew is not defective of Numbers, but hath the singular and the plural as distinct as the English; If therefore the Translators had used* [You] *for* [Thou] *instead of one objection there would have been two.* p.30.

Min. He needed not to have so gravely told us, that the Hebrew is not defective of numbers; for who knoweth not, that no Language can be without them? But by this Rabbi's good leave,

leave, neither is the Hebrew defective of Figures, especially one common both to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, called *Enallage Numeri*; by which is justified the use of the Plural Number, when the signification is singular; * of which I could produce abundance of instances out of the Holy Scriptures; Take these few; *Jud.* 12. 7. *He was buried in one of the Cities of Judah*: The Hebrew text in the Latin version is rendred word for word *Sepultus Civitatibus, &c.* buried in the Cities. So *Gen.* 3. 8. *They hid themselves among the Trees, &c.* according to the Hebrew it should be [Tree] in the singular number; hereupon *Menochius* notes, *Arbor ponitur pro* [Arbores] *per Enallagen Numeri.* Josh. 24. 19. *He is an Holy God, &c.* Where [Holy] (in the Original) is in the plural, and [God] in the singular number; for it is not unusual for Adjectives and Verbs in the Hebrew to be joyn'd with Substantives in the plural number.

* See Dr. *Ham.* on *Mat.* 27. 44.

See *Buxtorf's* Thes. Gram. linguæ sacræ. p. 422, 424, 425.

Pray consult *Job* 18. 2. where you will find *Bildad* speaking thus to *Job*, *How long will it be ere YOU make an end of words?* And *Daniel* speaks thus (*Dan.* 2. 36.) *This is the Dream and WE will tell the interpretation thereof*: So that you see in these instances (long enough before the Roman Empire I wot) that both a good man was spoken to, and a good man spake of himself in the plural number: Holy *Daniel* of himself says [*We*;] and upright *Job* receives the Title [*You*] when he was far from being an object of *flattery*, and *Bildad* a miserable comforter driving on a quite con-

trary extreme. Nay God Almighty ſpeaks of himſelf in the plural number! As *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let US make man, and in OUR Image*; And ſo *Gen.* 3. 12. and 11. 7. *Iſa* 6. 8. And the firſt time that God is named in Scripture, he is, in the Original, expreſt in the plural number, *Gen.* 1. 2.

Par. Thoſe inſtances in *Job* and *Daniel* I never obſerv'd before, and muſt confeſs they are very convincing: But as to *Gen.* 1. 26, &c. I have often heard that the plural number there repreſents the three perſons in the Bleſſed Trinity.

Min. This is an anſwer that perhaps *Elwood* will not thank you for, becauſe the Quakers (at leaſt many of them) deny the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity; to ſuch a pitch of Blaſphemy and Hereſie are they already arrived: However theſe Scriptures will bring the Quakers into this *Dilemma*; Either to acknowledge the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, or elſe to confeſs, from the example of God himſelf, that it's neither unlawful nor improper, to ſpeak *of* a ſingle perſon in the plural number: If ſo, then is it as lawful to ſpeak *to* a ſingle perſon in the ſame number; for if God ſay [WE] and [US] of himſelf, it would not have been improper to ſay [YOU] to him, ſeeing one is but the Relative of the other. Therefore though we ſhould ſuppoſe [*You*] to be only plural, this way of uſeing it would be ſufficiently juſtified by the inſtances already given: yet after all this, you are to conſider, that while [*Thou*] is ſingular, [*Ye*] plural, Cuſtom

(the

(the only Law-giver in these Cases) has so far prevail'd, that [*You*] is become either singular or plural, as some Pronouns * are in the Hebrew. Therefore the Translators might (if they had pleas'd) have warrantably used it instead of [*Thou.*] *Buxtorf. p. 21.

Par. But *T.E.* likes not that your discourse should *lean* so much upon Custom.

Min. of this I said sufficiently in the Conference; but let me ask you further; Is there any one general rule of speech appointed by God? Or is it arbitrary, in the choice of men in each particular Society?

Par. I never heard that any one Dialect was ever commanded by God; for if so, he would not have divided it, as we read he did *Gen.* 11. Therefore I suppose it is arbitrary according to the consent of each Society.

Min. Custom then being the expression of that consent, must be the standard of speech in every Society. And in this Case the World will subscribe to the determination of *Horace.* Hor. de Art. Poet.

Multa renascentur quæ jam cecidere, cadentq;
Quæ nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus;
Quem penes arbitrium est, & jus & norma loquendi.

Much phrase that now is dead, shall be reviv'd,
And much shall dye, that now is nobly liv'd,
If Custom please; at whose disposing will
The power, and rule of speaking resteth still.

Words may be compared to *Coin*, which is worth just so much as it goes for. Yea, they may by Custom be turn'd into a quite contrary signification

ſignification to that which formerly they had. As for Example; *Tyrannus* a Tyrant formerly ſignified the *beſt*, now the *worſt* of Princes. *Magus* did in ancient times ſignifie a *wiſe man*, now a *Magitian*. And though [*Knave*] denotes now a diſhoneſt perſon, yet it did formerly ſignifie no more than a *Servant*.

Ellwood confeſſes that he lived in the Country when he wrote his Book: Now it Cuſtom do's not alter words, and is not the rule of ſpeech; Why ſhould he take it ill, if I ſay he was a *Villan**? ſeeing the word, till cuſtom fixt an evil ſignification to it, meant no more than an *inhabitant* of the Country, or one that dwelt in a Village.

* Villanus qui in villâ habitat. *Spelman's Gloſs.* p. 557.

And if the Apoſtle plead Cuſtom in the uſe of Garments and habits, in being cover'd in the Aſſemblies, or uncover'd: Surely it's as good a plea in the uſe of words and phraſes. Now whereas Controverſies about indifferent things can never be determin'd by any reaſon drawn from the nature of them; and the peace of the Church notwithſtanding requires their determination one way or other; the Apoſtle in the Controverſie aforeſaid betakes himſelf to Cuſtom as his laſt Refuge, *ver.* 16. *If any man ſeem to be contentious, we have no ſuch* CUSTOM, *neither the Churches of God:* The reaſon is because men may diſpute about indifferent things to the Worlds end, and yet be no nearer peace Private perſons therefore in things of this nature, muſt be over-ruled by the Cuſtom of the Church.

Par.

Par. There's one thing that I wonder at in him, that he ſhould ſay, You *confeſs that in Religious Offices* [Thou] *is the fitteſt word to be uſed.* ibid.

Min. I ſuppoſe he has taken this upon truſt, as he has done his Authors: For you may remember that my words were theſe, *It's only in Civil matters that we ſay* [*You*] *to a ſingle perſon; but in Religious Offices, we ſay* [Thou] *to the greateſt Perſonages upon earth* *: Yet from this very paſſage, has this Quaker the confidence to infer, that *if it be high enough for God and Spiritual affairs, I ſee not how it ſhould be too low for Man and Temporal affairs.* p. 30. Did I either ſay, or did my words imply, that it was too low for man, when I ſaid that in *Religious Offices* we *uſe it to the greateſt Perſonages upon earth*? Is this an honeſt way of anſwering Books, by making a falſe quotation, in order to a falſe inference? As for the different uſe of it in Temporal and Spiritual affairs, that is a thing in it ſelf wholly indifferent, as I gave you ſufficient account in the Conference, which he no where denies, but takes it for granted, and therefore is the more ſchiſmatical in contending.

T. E. did well to name no page, as conſcious of the miſquotation.

* Conf. p. 18.

Par. But he leaves it at laſt to the conſideration of every unprejudic't Reader whether that Dialect which God is pleaſed to accept, that wherein he has been pleaſed to deliver himſelf, that which all the Holy Prophets, our Bleſſed Saviour, his Apoſtles, and all good men in the beſt times, is not fitter for a Chriſtian now to uſe, than that which depends only upon a Cuſtom

ſprung

ſprung up out of the putrefaction of corrupt times? p.31.

Min. By theſe laſt words of his, he has ſpoiled Quakeriſm, which we may impeach as *ſprung up out of the putrefaction of corrupter times*, than thoſe he mentions: *In the midſt of wars and fightings* (as a Quaker confeſſes*) when the Throne was uſurped, when Religion and Property were invaded in the heat of our civil broils and diſtractions, up ſtarts the Quaker.

*Spirit of the Hat. p.3.

As for the dialect he contends for; you muſt know, that God did not accept of it for its own goodneſs as better than any other, but ſo that he would have accepted another as well as it; And when himſelf and the beſt men uſed it, they did it in compliance to the Cuſtoms of ſpeech at that time. Yet the Dialect at ſome times varied (as has been proved) and yet was no leſs accepted of by God; To ſhew, that he deſign'd not to bind the Conſcience to any particular form of ſpeech.

But will he not (think you) allow the Primitive Chriſtians to be as good men, as the Heathen Romans before their Empire? Of thoſe ancient Chriſtians, who lived under the Empire (at which time *Elwood* confeſſes [*You*] to a ſingle perſon was uſed) *Juſtin Martyr*, who lived in the time of *Antonius* the Emperor, gives this account; *The Chriſtians (ſays he) are not diſtinguiſhed from others by their Country, ſpeech nor any peculiar Cuſtoms: They inhabit not Cities appropriate to them alone, nor do they uſe a DIALECT differing from other*

men

men, nor is their manner of living unlike to other men; They follow the CUSTOMS of their Country in Clothes, Dyet and other things, &c. This shews that the Primitive Christians were nothing like our Quakers, in the singularity of Garb, Tone, Phrases and Behaviour, wherein they affect to be unlike other men, even in the most innocent Customs. I wish they would imitate these Primitive Christians, and follow that good old rule, *vivere moribus antiquis, loqui verbis præsentibus*, To live after the ancient manners, but to speak after the present Dialect.

* Just. Mart. Epis. ad Diogen. p. 446, 497.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of Titles and Civil Reſpects.

Par. IN *T. E's.* third Chapter of Titles and Civil Reſpects, he briskly charges you with *dealing injuriouſly and diſhoneſtly with the Quakers*, and moreover adds, that we have *befool'd* our ſelves. *p.* 31, 32, 33.

Min. This Quaker is a right Conformiſt to the humour of his Party, and a true Practicant here of this Uncivil tenent of theirs, againſt Civil Reſpects. His firſt work is to render me ſuſpected and ridiculous, that mens ill opinions of me may give advantage to his feeble reaſonings: But I am willing to put my ſelf upon my Trial; How do's he make good his charge?

Par. Whereas I told you in the Conference, *That poſſibly I had been faulty in ſuffering my Servant to call me Maſter*; He accuſes you for inferring; that *the Quakers have brought this tenent of theirs* [againſt the civil Title of Maſter, founded on Mat. 23. 10.] *to this ſtrange reſult, that a child muſt honour his Father, but not call him Father; that a Servant muſt obey his Maſter, but not call him Maſter; which tenent (he ſays) is your own, not theirs, as their writings & practices ſufficiently evidence.* p. 32.

Min. I made not the inference from your words immediately, but from the Quakers way of alledging that Text, utterly beſide the ſcope and

and intention of it; For the words just before my inference were these, *In the same notion that we are forbidden to call* [*Master,*] *we are likewise forbidden to call* [*Father.*] And seeing that that Text and the next before it forbidding to call *Father* and *Master*, concern not temporal but such spiritual Titles only, as imply a Mastership and Dominion over the Conscience; it follows, that while the Quakers extend the Text from Spiritual to Temporal Titles (as they have done all along) they make even *that* of a *Natural Father* to be equally forbidden by it, *that* being but a temporal Title no more than any other. So that the practice of those Quakers, who receive of their Children the Title of Father, evidently contradicts the result of the Quakers Tenent against Civil Titles, as it is founded on the said Text.

And whereas he tells his Reader, *that this is contrary to their universal practice, and a foppery fasten'd on them.* p. 42. You shall hear what one *John Toldervy* says as to this point, having been desirous to draw Coll. *Webb* (his Master) to Quakerism; he, after his return from his errors, gives this following relation, *I took him by the arm and bad him sit down* William Web, *not bowing, not pulling off the hat, not Master, for then I denyed that Title to him, though related to him a Servant, as afterwards I denyed all Relations, from the words of one,* **He that liveth in the Light will see no difference.** Which shews that it was not his private opinion only.

See the Foot out of the snare p. 17.

Par. His other instance of dishonesty, wherewith he chargeth you, is this; that in our discourse

courſe we ſhould faſten on the Quakers the abſurdity of applying that place in *Luk.* 10. 4. [*Salute no man by the way*] to themſelves in a literal ſenſe: *ibid.*

Min. Surely he will not deny that it has been a known cuſtom among the Quakers, to paſs by their Neighbours unſaluted. Beſides 'tis well known, that when we uſed to bid them *Good morrow*, *Goodſpeed* and the like; they frequently reproved ſuch ſalutations in the words of this Text. Might not the Quaker with equal modeſty deny, that ever his Brethren uſed to *Quake* and *Foam*, as deny a thing ſo generally known as this is? Have the Quakers forgot, that *James Naylor* (before whom they ſung their blaſphemous Hoſanna's) thus applied this Text; That he did ſo, appears by a * Book called *The Perfect Phariſee*, ſubſcribed by Five Miniſters of *Newcaſtle*.

*p 31,32.

Now if ſome, or many of the Quakers be laughed out of this abſurdity, muſt my honeſty be taxed, becauſe they vary from themſelves and one another? But would it not (think you) have been more honeſt in him and ingenious to have ſaid, *Truly it was our former practice ſo to apply that Text, but ſince we ſaw the folly and weakneſs of it, and that Spirit we truſted to did deceive us, we have left it off.*. I pray God they may henceforth learn to ſuſpect that deluſive Spirit which they have truſted ſo long, and leave off the reſt of their errors, not only for the ridiculouſneſs of them, but for Conſcience ſake.

But here I muſt deſire the Quakers to take notice that *Salutation* (which is an outward and civil

civil reſpect) is by this Quaker implicitly granted to be lawful and commendable; while he inſinuates the denying it to be an *abſurdity*, p. 32. and while he paſſes by the Reaſons and † Quotations I gave to prove it. Therefore he has done very ill, while his Conſcience convinc'd him of the duty of Civil Reſpects, to write ſo rudely againſt them, as he has done in this Chapter: But now let me hear wherein we have *befool'd* our ſelves.

† Mat. 10. 12. Rom. 16. Phil. 4. 21. 1 Cor. 16. 19. 2 Cor. 13 13. Conf. p. 27.

Par. Becauſe I profeſſed my ſincere and cordial reſpects to you at our firſt meeting; He thinks that by my objecting againſt civil reſpects afterwards, I contradicted my ſelf, and that the *decorum* was ill obſerved there; *Was this* (ſays he) *a fit perſon to repreſent the whole body of the Quakers, and diſpute againſt reſpecting perſons? Nay do's it not look like a deſign laid to miſ-ſtate our Principles and miſrepreſent us to the world?* p. 33.

Min. Indeed he ſeems here wonderfully tranſported with his own conceit: But that he may not hurt himſelf with too much mirth, let us conſider the Caſe: Pray, what were the reſpects you profeſſed unto me? Anſwer for your ſelf.

Par. My inward reſpects: And therefore I called them *ſincere and cordial*.

Min. Were thoſe the reſpects which afterwards you objected againſt?

Par. No; I was not ſuch a Brute, for inward reſpects are nothing but *Love*, which is the *fulfilling of the Law*; But it was outward Reſpects and Titles only I then ſcrupled at.

Min. I believe you: For any man of common ſenſe may eaſily ſee this diſtinction in the
p. 3. Conference; For in my reply, I told you that *I accepted the expreſſions of your affection.*

If your Controverſie had been againſt the ſame reſpects which before you had ſo heartily profeſſed, this indeed had been ſome *indecorum*; but ſeeing it was againſt a different thing, I doubt the Quaker has brought the *indecorum* upon himſelf, and in the reſult a great deal of ſhame too, both on himſelf and his whole party; for while he inveighs thus againſt all reſpects, without diſtinction, and againſt your unfitneſs to repreſent the body of the Quakers upon this very account: From hence it plainly follows, that to repreſent the Quakers bearing any *ſincere and cordial reſpects to their Neighbours* is a grand *Indecorum, a deſign laid to miſtake their Principles, a miſrepreſenting them, yea the whole body of them to the World.* So that I ſee, a man had need be cautious, how he repreſents a Quaker, either as good natur'd, kind, or affectionate; For if he do, beware he meets not with my fate, to be call'd a fool for his pains.

Par. I doubt it's the Quaker that has here beſool'd himſelf; Yet do not you take notice of that Heavenly expreſſion of his after it? *But our confidence is in the Lord our God, whoſe truth we are engaged to defend.* ibid.

Min. Here you have more of his *Canting*, that old art of deceiving, which has enſnared ſo many weak people, and brought true Religion

ligion into ſuſpition and contempt: Is it not ſtrange that after ſo injurious and ridiculous a paſſage, he ſhould have the impudence to pretend *confidence in the Lord, &c.* and go to him to patronize his folly and diſhoneſty? I mention not this to diſcourage any true ſeriouſneſs among Chriſtians (I wiſh there were more of it) but to convince you, that all is not Gold that gliſters.

Par. I muſt confeſs I have been apt to be carried away with fine words and pretences, but could never ſuſpect ſo much deceit and deluſion in them as you have diſcover'd to me: But I hope this will be a fair warning to me to take heed hereafter whom I truſt.

But as for that expoſition you gave me of Saint *James chap.* 2. 1,2,3,4. as not accuſing civil reſpects, but ſuch only as violated juſtice in their publick conſiſtories, he diſlikes as not being the *Apoſtles drift.* p.34.

Min. Firſt obſerve here that *T.E.* overcome by truth hath wittingly paſs'd by *Acts* 10. 34. [*God is no reſpecter of perſons*] as nothing to his purpoſe, though all along objected by the Quakers againſt Civil Reſpects; And he ſays nothing againſt the account I gave you of the words: I wiſh the Quakers by theſe and other inſtances may at length diſcover that Spirit of error, they have been ſo long led by to pervert the Scriptures.

Now as for that expoſition I gave you from Dr. *Hammond* of that paſſage in Saint *James*, it is ſufficiently defenſible againſt the Cavils of this confident Quaker: I need not now trouble

you nor my self with a recital of all the reasons he gives for that interpretation, but refer you to the Annotations themselves: Only I shall ad two or three instances more of the word συναγωγὴ Assembly, in the Text, being used for a Court of Judicature, 1. *Mac.* 7.12. *Hist. Susan. v.* 41. *Luk.* 12. 11. *when they bring you unto Synagougues, and unto Magistrates and Powers,* &c. *Acts* 22. 19. —— *they know that I imprisoned, and beat in every Synagegue them that believed on thee.* Moreover in the following verses the Apostle interprets his own meaning, and chiefly *v.* 4. where 'tis clear, that by respecting of persons he means only corruption and partiality in Judgment; *Are ye not* (says he) *partial in your selves, and become judges of evil thoughts?* This is agreeable to the Law *Lev.* 19. 15. *Deut.* 1. 17. *Thou shalt not have respect of persons in judgment*; And it is to the *Law* that Saint *James* refers expresly *v.* 9. *but if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the Law as transgressors*; making this no new prohibition, but only a recital of an old one. If then civil respects were not forbidden by any precedent *Law*, neither are they forbidden here: But by the *Law* they are so far from being forbidden, that they are enjoyn'd as a duty, and practised by the best of men; of which I gave you several instances in the *Conference*, which *T.E.* untairly passes by. Take these over and above, *Lev.* 19. 32. *Lam.* 4. 16. *Deut.* 28.50. 2 *Kings* 3. 14. But what reasons do's *T.E.* give of his dislike of that exposition I gave of *Jam.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 4?

Seld. de Jur. Nat. & Gent. juxta Heb. lib. 4. cap. 9.

Par.

Par. Becauſe the Epiſtle of Saint *James* was written to the diſperſed believing Jews, thereupon he bids his Reader *conſider what conſiſtories or Courts of Judicature thoſe poor ſcatter'd believers could then have.* p. 35.

Min. That they had ſuch places in the Gentile Cities may be confirmed from * *Epiphanius* and * *Euſebius*; And there were Jews at this time in all the eminent Cities of the *Roman* Empire, who had Officers and Judges of their own, and by the † Reſcripts of *Auguſtus*, they were allowed to uſe their own Laws and Cuſtoms; all which priviledges they retained till their Rebellion againſt the *Romans*, but afterwards they were reſtored by the Emperors *Arcadius* and *Honorius*.

* Epiph. hæ. 30. Etion. Canar. lib. 1. Tom. 2.
* Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. Lib. 5. cap. 16. ibid. *Sim. Petit's* variæ Lect. lib. 2 c. 10. p. 146. And Dio. cap. 37.
† Joſeph. Antiq. lib. 16. c. 6.

Par. But were not thoſe the unbelieving Jews?

Min. Let it be conſider'd that the Primitive Chriſtians were by the Romans long eſteemed a ſect of the Jews, and ſo they had a ſhare in all the priviledges of that People; Nor were the ſorreign Jews ſo malicious againſt the Chriſtians, as thoſe in and about *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* 13. 15. and 28. 17, 31. So that the believing Jews might have juſtice adminiſtred in thoſe Courts belonging to their Nation, or elſe might have private Conſiſtories among themſelves, which we may believe they would rather chuſe, becauſe St. *Paul* had forbid them *to go to Law before the Unbelievers*, and adviſed them to end their queſtions among themſelves, 1 *Cor.* 6. 1, 2, 3. So that it is the Quakers old diſeaſe of ignorance which makes him

wonder, how they ſhould have any Courts of *Judicature* in their diſperſion.

Par. To that Law you mention'd of both parties ſitting or ſtanding to avoid partiality, *&c. T.E.* anſwers, *Whence had they it? If given them by God, we ſhould have found it among thoſe Laws which they received from him; If it was not from God, but an invention and tradition of their own, it's altogether improbable that the Apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt would have reference thereunto.* p. 36.

Min. What thinks he of the Feaſts of Purim, and that other of Dedication, which our Saviour countenanc'd by his preſence *Joh.* 10.? Theſe were no inſtitutions immediately received from God, but of the Jews own making. *Pliny* tells us of a vain Painter, who being to draw a Goddeſs, made it exactly like his own Miſtreſs; ſuch is the fanſie of this Quaker, who being about to deſcribe Jeſus and his Apoſtles, thinks they are altogether ſuch as himſelf; and ſince their practice is unknown to him, he fancies They were as much for innovation and novelty as himſelf: And hence it is that he is for throwing away all Laws and Traditions. Chriſt and his Apoſtles were not ſo; They were not for throwing away any Traditions, that promoted either piety or morality; and none but one of *T. E*'s. capacity will queſtion it. Our Lord would not ſuffer a Veſſel to be carried through the Temple (to teach us Reverence to the place of God's Worſhip) which was an Antient Tradition,

Mark 11. 16.

dition, and is recorded in the *Talmud.* * So likewiſe Saint *Paul* orders the Chriſtians to receive their meat with thanksgiving; which Cuſtom has been religiouſly obſerved by the Ancient Chriſtians. † Which I note the rather, becauſe the Quakers ſo brutiſhly neglect this piece of univerſal Religion. Again this very Apoſtle *James*, *ch.* 4.15. commands the Chriſtians to ſay, *If the Lord will, we will do this or that*: which is known to be a Tradition of the old Rabbins, recorded alſo by *Ben. Syra.* Why then may not St. *James* as probably relate to this Cuſtom, which is founded upon ſo much equity, and which is but an inſtance of that Divine precept, *Deut.* 1. 17. in the Rabbinical way of illuſtration?

This ſeditious paſſage of his would ſet Chriſtianity at odds with all the Civil ſanctions in the world, and make it indeed inconſiſtent with all Government, becauſe every Magiſtrate do's not receive his Laws immediately from God.

Par. If this Law (ſays he) *was but a ſanction of their own, the Jews were ſo ſuperſtitiouſly zealous for the Traditions of their Forefathers, that it's no way likely that they would ſo poſitively violate a Law of their making.* Ibid. And he goes on to tell us, that *this was a thing they were ſeldom guilty of, for they too often preferred their own Traditions even to the Law of God.* p. 37.

Min. What his *fideles Judæi, his poor ſcatter'd believers*, who, as he had juſt immediately before ſaid, *were then coming off not only from*

* Tract. Maſſ. Jevamot. c. 1.

1 Tim. 4. 4, 5.

† Nec Cibi ſumantur niſi Oratione præmiſſâ, nec recedatur à menſâ niſi referatur Creatori gratia. Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Euſtoch. & Tert. Apolog. cap 39.

Which aroſe firſt from a Jewiſh Tradition. Talm. tract Berach. cap. 1, &c.

‖ *See* Druſ. Quæſt. Heb. l. 3.

the Traditions of their Elders, but even from the whole Jewish polity? I assure you he wrongs them as much as he contradicts himself.

Par. You told me that if St. *James* had forbidden Civil respects, *he had contradicted what our Lord plainly alloweth in* Luk. 14. 8. 9, 10. *when thou art bidden of any man to a wedding, sit not down in the highest room, lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him,* &c. *Now for the understanding this Scripture,* T. E. tells us, that *it must be considered in what time, and to whom those words were spoken. For the time, it was under the Law, before the one Offering was actually offer'd up. That was an Outward state, the People of God was then an Outward National People, their Religion and Worship was much outward and shadowy, their Wars were outward, their Ornaments were outward, their Honours and Respects to one another were outward. And in this State many things were indulged to the Jews, many things permitted & connived at, partly because of the hardness of their Hearts, and partly by reason of their Weakness. But this State was to last but till the Time of Reformation, and when the Time of Reformation was fully come, these things grew out of use,* &c. p. 37, 38.

Min. Was Christ's time then no time of Reformation? What though the *Levitical* Priesthood, it's Rites and Sacrifices, being Types of the Sacrifice of Christ, were to continue till they were fulfilled in their Antitype, and then to expire of themselves; though that Dispensation was in this respect reformed after;

ter; Do's this prove that whatsoever in reference to the Moral Law, or to good manners, he found less perfect, he might not, or did not in his own person reform before his Offering up? Do's this prove that Christ was no Reformer? What though the Reformation was not so general till the more plentiful effusion of the Spirit, do's this prove it was not actually begun, and set on foot, before Christ's death, both by his Doctrine, and visible effects of it, upon both Jews and Gentiles *Mark* 1. 15. *Mat.* 11. 5. and 8. 10, 13. and 15. 28? Were all Christ's Sermons, the calling of the Twelve Apostles, and the Seventy Disciples, and sending them forth to Preach, His healing of Mens Bodies and Souls together, Was all this no method of Reformation? He disproved the corrupt Traditions of the Elders, whereby they made void the Commandments of God, He reformed the imperfection of *Moses*'s Law in the case of Divorces, and reduced Marriage to its Primitive institution, *Mat.* 19. Denounced eight Woes together against the Scribes and Pharisees, He asserted and cleared the Moral Law (in his Sermon on the Mount) from the false Glosses the Jewish Doctors had put upon it; and advanced the Law of Nature (whereof the Moral Law is the transcript) to the highest pitch; And was not all this sufficient to make Christ a Reformer? He is our sole Lawgiver; and what the Apostles taught after his offering up, was his own Law, which himself had deliver'd before his death, and which the Spirit was promised to *bring into* Joh. 14. 25.

their

their remembrance. If therefore Civil Reſpects were ſo *vain and evil a Cuſtom* as *T.E.* makes them. *p.*41. is it likely that ſo ſevere a Reformer ſhould not only Connive at them, but expreſly allow them, as he does *Luke* 14.10? As *Ellwood* implicitly grants he did, not denying it, but uſing an abſurd and an odd circuit of words to ſhuffle it off. Though therefore the Phariſees ambition and affectation of the chief Seats was rebuked by our Saviour; yet it is evident the diſtinction of perſons and places, and ſuch good manners as are founded thereon, were none of thoſe things which he diſliked, or deſign'd ever to remove. What though the State of the Church in the time of the Law was in a great meaſure Outward, and the Legal Ceremonies of the *Levitical* Prieſthood upon Chriſt's death expired? What though a more inward and Spiritual Worſhip * was enjoyn'd under the Goſpel, and the Spirit of God to that end poured out more plentifully than ever? Did this prove that to Chriſtians all outward things are vaniſht, and ſuch things as no way belonged to that Prieſthood? Are their Bodies vaniſht too? What then will become of that injunction, *Glorifie God in your Body*--- 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. Are we *now* deveſted of all outward capacities and concernments? Untill he can prove this, he muſt allow Chriſtians ſuch outward Cuſtoms and uſages, as are agreeable to this preſent State; ſuch (among the reſt) are Civil Reſpects, being ſutable to that diſtinction, which Providence and the State of this World have made of perſons and places, in

* *According to thoſe Scriptures* T. E. *quotes,* 2 Cor. 5. 17. Rom. 2 28,29. Joh. 4. 21, 22, 23, &c.

in the various relations which we find in all Civil Societies: He that is an enemy to this distinction, is an enemy to all Government, which cannot subsist without it; for we must distinguish between Rulers and Subjects, Governors and Governed, both in Common Wealths and private Families. What madness then is it to think, that Christ meant to take away Civil Respects and good Manners, things that are so necessary to uphold this distinction & essential to it, as the due acknowledgment and proper expressions of it? Therefore he abolish'd not those decent Customs of them, which are upon Record in the Old Testament, or any where else; But all quotations out of the Old Testament to this purpose must needs be still in force.

Par. You have thus far given me very good satisfaction in this point; & if you have any thing further to add to it, I pray go on to clear it, not only to me, but to all others who do ignorantly scruple it, as I have done.

Min. The great duty of a Christian is Universal Friendship, but as Friendship is *amicitia parium aut imparium*, of Equals or Unequals; So the signification of that Friendship requires different expressions; since the state of the World, and the constitution of Societies necessarily infers a distribution of persons into several ranks higher and lower; the foundations of which distribution are these following,

First, difference of Age calls for different behaviour, *Lev.*19.32. *Thou shalt rise before the hoary head, and honour the face of the Old man. The face of the Old man* here is the gavity of his person:

Job 32. 4. person: So that respect to mens persons is not always evil, but oft times a duty. See also 1 *Tim.* 5.1. *Intreat an old man as a Father.*

Secondly, Difference of sex, 1 *Cor.* 11. 3,4,5. And the Ordinance of Marriage makes Man the head of the Wife, and requires expressions of subjection from the Woman to the Man, as *T. E.* himself acknowledges in the example of *Sarah* obeying *Abraham*, and calling him Lord.

Thirdly, All domestick and civil relations, implying superiority and inferiority, as not only Husband and Wife, but Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, all which *T.E.* acknowledges: Why not then between Magistrates and Subjects? seeing Magistrates are Fathers of their Country, and every Ruler is properly a Master; for Christ himself calls *Nicodemus* a *Master of Israel*, *Joh.* 3. 10.

Fourthly, Different occupations and employments, some being honourable and others mean, make one rank of men higher than another. *Exod.* 11.5. *Jud.* 16.21. *Acts* 17.5. where you have mention of *the baser sort.*

Fifthly, By reason of the necessity of publick Offices for civil Government, some men must needs be publick, some private persons; Publick Persons must have an eminency above private; And Kings in Scripture are lookt upon as *Sacred*; and the Jewish Rulers and Judges frequently styled Gods, *Exod.* 22.28. *Ps.* 82. 6. *Jo.* 10. 34. which is a much higher Title of respect, than any we give in our addresses to them; therefore it was boldly done of *T.E.* to quarrel at the Title of *Most Sacred Majesty*, and *Dread Sovereign*, as he do's

do's *p.* 46. seeing all these are essential to the Title of King, which the Quakers own, and are willing to give him. Pray read these places, *Ps.* 21.5. 1 *Chr.* 29.25. *Dan.* 4.36,37.

Sixthly, Nearness to, or distance from such as are Eminent Persons, thus they that are near the Kings Person gain an eminence by it. *Est.* 1. 14. *Jer.* 52.25. And so the Civil Law looketh upon men as more eminent, as they are nearer the Emperor: And we do find abundance of these reckon'd up in Scripture, *Dan.* 3.27. and many other places. And the Scripture speaks of different Ranks of Nobility, and freely gives them their usual titles without any scruple. Thus we read of Princes, *Gen.* 17.20. and 2 *Sam.* 19.6, &c. of Dukes, *Exod.* 15.15. *Jos.* 13.21. *Gen.* 36.15, &c. of Lords *Dan.* 5.1.9. *Ezr.* 8.25. *Neh.* 7.5. And in the New Testament, *Mark* 6.21. where 'tis said, that *Herod made a Supper to his Lords*, &c. Note here, that St. *Mark* writes not like a Quaker; He do's not say, He made a Supper to his Lords, *as they call them*; Nor like *Elwood*, who is so demure, that forsooth he dare not name *Titles and Civil Respects* without this same reserve [*as they are called.*†]

† See Title of his third Chapter.

Seventhly, By civil vertues and great exploits Men justly gain an Eminency and Renown, and become famous. See *Ruth* 4.11,14. *Num.* 16.2. and 1.16. 1 *Chron.* 5.24. and 12.30. *Ezek.* 23.23.

Eighthly, When persons have larger priviledges and immunities granted to them in the Commonwealth, they gain an eminency by them: thus Noblemen are constituted by that the Lawyers call *Dominium Nobilium*, whereby they have *jus præcedentiæ*, a right of

of precedency; and *Locus potior decernendi*, aud other things of like nature; Therefore they have Ornaments allotted to them, which they call Ἡγεμονίας κοσμήματα, and Titles to adorn them, whih are no other than certain marks of their civil valuation. For it is past dispute, that as some Men are of much more value to the publick than others (*viz.* Able Commanders, Judges, *&c.*) So publick Governors have power to determine the rates both of Men and Things, and to signifie the value they set upon one Man above another by giving him a higher place and a title.

Ninthly, These priviledges being propagated to posterity and made hereditary (for *Patrum conditionem liberi sequuntur*, as the Law speaks) make different Families in respect of superiority and inferiority; These advancements descending to their Children, being encouragements to civil vertues, and great actions; And 'tis hard to conceive how these things can be otherwise in this World, without † danger to that order which is necessary to the subsistence of each civil Society.

† Nulla Universitas potest subsistere, nisi eam Ordo servet & sustinear. Bodin. de Re publ. l. 3.

These things and the like must necessarily distinguish persons into several ranks and classes, as *Servius Tullius* distributed the Roman Citizens; and this the Scripture freely acknowledges, for we read also of Nobles *Exod.* 24. 11. *Jer.* 27. 20. and the Sons of Nobles *Eccl.* 10. 17. The Title of Honourable *Isa.* 3. 3, 5. *Mar.* 15. 43. *Acts* 13. 50. and 17. 12. The word τίμιος, by which the Scriptures expres

men

men of worth, was uſed by the Greeks as a Title to ſalute a Gentleman.

For ſeeing there are different ranks of Men downwards from the King to the Peaſant, therefore as you ſee it is agreeable to holy Scripture; ſo all ſober men will acknowledge it is agreeable to Reaſon alſo, to give to each rank ſuch diſtinct Titles as are proper to expreſs that difference.

And with what reverence and outward civil reſpects the Primitive Chriſtians behaved themſelves to their Governors, may be ſeen in *Juſtin Martyr Apol.* 2. And what is any where ſaid, that true piety is the Fountain of Honour or the like, is meant in a Religious ſenſe, and concerns the inward man, and is not at all intended to exclude thoſe civil diſtinctions among men, in reference to their outward capacities; To ſuppoſe otherwiſe were very ridiculous.

Par. The caſe is ſtill clearer to me, and you have made *T. E's.* way of reaſoning appear ſufficiently abſur'd.

Min. I ſhall make it more apparent before I have done, by giving you a Liſt both of his Abſurdities and Self-contradictions contained in this one Paragraph we are now upon.

Firſt Abſurdity, in implying that Chriſt's death put an end to his Moral documents, this of *Luk.* 14.10. being one.

2 *Abſur.* that all Political Government is now at an end, and God's People muſt be now no more an outward National people.

3 *Abſur.* In making the uſe of the Sword unlawful, now in the time of Reformation, in contra-

contradiction to *Rom.* 13.4. where 'tis said that *the Magistrate bears not the Sword in vain*, hereby condemning two good Centurions, him in *Mat.* 8. 9, 10. and *Cornelius Acts* 10. 1, 2. who was after Christ's death. By this Rule neither forreign invasions, nor intestine Rebellions must be opposed, nor prevented by any outward means; But we have no reason to trust the Quaker here, seeing divers of his Brethren bore Arms and Offices in the late Army, yet at the same time professed Quakerism, and I can name the persons, were there occasion for it.

4 *Absur.* In going about to prove outward things connived at by Christ, and indulged to the Jews for the hardness of their hearts, by that very Text in *Mat.* 19. 8. which is an express and plain instance of his forbidding and reforming those arbitrary divorces which Moses suffer'd.

5 *Absur.* in saying in such general terms that the State of the Church in Christ's time was Outward, and Worship Outward, and in that notion afterwards to vanish; as if after Christ's death, the Church were not to retain any Outward State, or Outward Worship; And consequently that all vocal Prayers, all gestures of Devotion, all Outward Ordinances, yea the very notion and being of the visible Church must vanish together.

6 *Absur.* in making no difference at all between the State of the Church under Christ's time, and under *Moses*'s contrary to these Scriptures, *Heb.* 1. 1. and 2. 1, 2, 3. and 3. 1, --7.

making

making the Doctrine of Chriſt no Goſpel.

Ellwood's ſelf-contradictions in this paſſage are theſe,

1 *Contrad.* His putting Outward Reſpects among thoſe things, which he ſays were indulged by our Saviour, to continue till the Reformation, and yet venturing to contradict himſelf in the expoſition he gives of *Mat.* 23. 10. wherein he affirms that civil titles are there forbidden.

2 *Contrad.* His ſaying, Outward honour went off after the death of Chriſt, in contradiction to his own acknowledgment of the Epithet (as he will have it) of *Moſt Noble*, given by St. *Paul* to *Feſtus*, who being a Heathen had no Chriſtian vertue to qualifie him for it, according to the Quakers principles.

3 *Contrad.* His putting Outward reſpects among other things, that were to ceaſe at the time of Reformation, in contradiction to what himſelf had implicitly yielded concerning the lawfulneſs of ſalutation *p.*32. which is an outward civil reſpect.

Par. But *T.E.* has another diſtinction, and bids his Readers conſider *to whom this in Luk.* 14. 10. *was ſpoken*; *They were Phariſees, of whom* (T. E. ſays) *there were ſeveral ranks and degrees, there were chief Phariſees, and inferiour Phariſees; and they took place one of another*, &c. *Nay there were ſeven ranks among them, as* Goodwin *tells us*, &c. p.40.

Min. The Quaker is out again; Where did he ever read of inferiour Phariſees? Indeed in

ver. 1. it's ſaid *one of the chief Phariſees*, but in the Greek 'tis ἀρχόντων, and ſignifies one of the *Sanhedrim*, as appears from *Luk.* 24. 20. *Jo.* 3. 1. *Acts* 3. 17. For though *Goodwin* tells him that there were ſeven ranks among the Phariſees, he do's not tell him, that they took place of one another by virtue of higher or lower ranks; for there was no ſuch matter, one Rank looking on themſelves to be as good as another: Hence the learned *Scultetus* ſaith *Phariſæorum ſeptem non claſſes aut ordines, ſed genera fuiſſe liquet.* And we may note by the way, that they who go about to explain Scripture upon pretence of their having the Spirit, do (if they want the ordinary means, *viz.* Learning ſanctified by the Spirit) ſoon baffle themſelves, and demonſtrate they have no true Spirit in them.

Ex Talmud Exercit Evang. lib. 1. cap. 24.

Par. But *what was that to his Diſciples* (ſays he?) *He puts them in mind of their Equality.* p. 41.

Min. Was there ever ſo groſs an abſurdity? As if the Saviour of the World, who came to Diſciple all mankind, ſhould allow that to one ſort of Men, and prohibit the ſame thing to another. But to let that paſs: Did ever Chriſt eſtabliſh ſuch an *equality*, as to take away all ſuperiority and ſubordination? How comes then the Quakers to allow that of *Maſter* and *Servant* p. 43. Chriſtians indeed are in reference to Almighty God all Equals, as to the capacity to Salvation, *Gal.* 3. 28. But I muſt ask your Leveller here, what is this to their Civil Capacity? which cannot be put off, while we are in theſe bodies.

Par.

Par. But he concludes his Comment on *Luk.* 14. 10. thus, *The words of the Apoſtle* James *may be underſtood a general prohibition of that vain Cuſtom of reſpecting perſons upon any occaſion whatſoever.* ibid.

Min. I ſhewed you before how this Quaker contradicts himſelf; Now I ſhall ſhew how the Quakers contradict one another. In a certain pamphlet called *a Treatiſe of Oaths*, ſubſcribed by thirteen Quakers, in the name of the reſt, and dedicated to the King and Parliament, you will find this expreſſion, *We do with all due* RESPECTS *preſent you with our Reaſons*, p. 3. Now do's St. *James* give *a general prohibition againſt all Reſpects*, both inward and outward, none excepted? Why then do the Quakers contradict their own Tenent? For according to *T. E.* the moſt ſincere and cordial reſpects are unlawful, and contrary to the Quakers Principles (as you have heard) and 'tis a vain and evil Cuſtom (as he ſays here) to give them upon any occaſion whatſoever. Why do's he rail againſt me and tax *my* honeſty? Why did he not rather tell his Brethren, that they did not obſerve their *Decorum?* and that *They were not a fit Company to repreſent the Body of the Quakers? Yea, do's not this paſſage look like a deſign laid to miſtake their Principles?* Why do's not *T.E.* tell them as much? yet he finds no fault with his Brethren for that which he condemns in Us; And therefore is deeply guilty of that partial reſpect, which both the Scripture and right Reaſon do every where condemn.

Par. I cannot imagine what ſhould hold the Quakers unſatisfied in this matter, unleſs it be this weak ſcruple, that they may reſpect *men* but not the *perſons* of men.

Min. Is not reſpecting *men* and the *perſons* of men all one? Can you make a difference between a *man* and his *perſon*? Do the Quakers underſtand, what the word they are contending for ſignifies? Do's it import any more, than honour, favour and kindneſs? To honour a man is to reſpect him; to favour a man is to reſpect him; to be kind to a man is to ſhew reſpects to him; Are theſe ſins?

As Reſpecting perſons relates to partiality, either in diſpenſing of the Goſpel, or the diſtribution of juſtice, ſo far it is a great ſin; But as it relates to honour, civility, humanity, and kindneſs; it's in that caſe ſo far from being a ſin, ſo far from being prohibited, that it is expreſly enjoyn'd and commanded us, *Lev.* 19.32. And it was reputed a ſin in *Iſrael*, that they *reſpected not the perſons of the Prieſts, and favoured not the Elders*, *Lam.* 4. 16. So that we are to reſpect perſons in one ſenſe, as we are not to reſpect them in another.

Par. To your Expoſition on *Mat.* 23. 10. *T. E.* I obſerve, agrees ſo far, as to ſay, *As little learning as you are willing to allow the Quakers, they are not ignorant that Chriſt did condemn the uſe of the word* Father, *as it implied an implicit faith in them to whom it was given; And alſo the word Maſter, as it denoted the chief, or head of a ſect and party.* p. 43.

Min.

Min. I would have you to obſerve alſo, how the Quaker is come down from the conceit of his Revelations ſo far, as at laſt to yield that Learning may be made uſe of to the underſtanding the true ſenſe of Scripture; which Conceſſion has taken away the force of his Eighth Chapter.

Par. But he tells us, that in that Text *Chriſt condemned alſo the uſe of thoſe Titles* [Father and Maſter] *in every ſenſe, where there is not a true relation*, that is (as he explains it) *by Nature or Law*, which he calls *a direct untruth.* ibid.

Min. As much learning as the Quaker thinks he has, it has failed him here; ſeeing this ſenſe which he has added, is neither agreeable to the occaſion and ſcope of that Text, nor is conſiſtent with other places of Scripture, wherein you will find Titles without either of theſe ſorts of Relation: I mention'd ſome in the *Conference*, which he unhandſomly paſſes by, as thoſe of St. *Stephen* and St. *Peter*, giving even their Perſecutors the Title of Fathers, *Acts* 7. 2. and 22. 1. and of our Bleſſed Saviour, who gave the Title of *Friend* to the Traitor *Judas*, *Mat.* 26. 50. Now which of theſe were due either by *Nature* or *Law?* Did our Saviour *contrary to his Nature* ſpeak an untruth? Or did he not rather in this paſſage intimate to us, that a Title of Civility is no untruth to whomſoever it is given, though to an enemy? Rom. 12. 21.

One thing let me ask you concerning St. *Paul*, Whether think you, was he a Married Man, or no?

Par. No, the contrary appears from 1 *Cor.* 7. 7.

Min. How comes *Ellwood* then (who acknowledges no Title due but by Nature or Law) to tell us, that *he exhorted his Son* Timothy *and his Son* Titus thus and thus *p.* 24? So that *T. E.* has either ſpoil'd St. *Paul's* Reputation, or his own Comment.

Par. But St. *Paul's* piety was above ſuch a reflexion: He was their Father in a holy ſenſe, in a ſpiritual relation, having *begotten them through the truth.*

Min. You are in the right: but then this is no thanks to our Quaker, who has excluded this of St. *Paul's* out of the Catalogue of his *lawful* Titles.

I will ask you another queſtion concerning *David*, who brought in and uſed Muſical Inſtruments in the ſervice of God; who, I pray, was his Father?

Par. Why? who, but *Jeſſe?*

Min. Yes, I ſhall find another Father for him in Scripture; which ſure *T. E.* never dreamt of, *viz.* Old *Jubal*, for he is ſaid to be *the Father of all that handle the Harp or Organ: Gen.* 4. 21. Now how do's this Title hold by *Nature* or *Law*? Could all the Muſicians in the World be *Jubal's* natural Sons?

I muſt ask you one queſtion more; What relation was there between *Abraham* (*the* FATHER *of the faithful*) and the rich Glutton, that he ſhould cry, *Father Abraham, Luk.* 16. 24? Where was there any ſuch relation, as *Ellwood* talks of?

Par.

Par. I know that after death there can be no relation by Nature or Law: But why do you fetch an instance from Hell?

Min. If that will not serve, I will fetch you one from Heaven: *Abraham* replied, *Son remember*, &c. *v.* 25.

Par. That was a Parable.

Min. Suppose it were; Did Christ use to deliver Parables in such terms, as were opposit to his own Commands?

Par. But is it not an untruth to call *them* Masters, and our selves *their* Servants, who in strictness cannot challenge that relation?

Min. Is it an untruth to profess a Duty? Are we not commanded to be *subject to one another*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. *In honour preferring one another*, *Rom.* 12. 10. And that *each esteem other better than himself*, Phil. 2. 3?

Par. But *T.E.* thinks, many do not intend to do any service for those they call *Masters*, and so 'tis *flattery*.

Min. Let the flattery be laid aside, not the innocent phrase, which expresses a Christian duty, *viz.* That we be ready to serve one another in all Offices of Civility: *By Love* (saith the Apostle) *serve one another*; which a Superiour may do to an Inferiour. Gal. 5. 13.

Par. *But Titles* (says he) *without relation we disown and reject, as being indeed Titles of flattery, which we dare no more make use of, than that good man who said of old*, Job. 31. 21, 22. *Let me not, I pray you, accept any mans person, neither let me give flattering Titles unto man.* p. 44.

Min. I ſuppoſe he brings not this quotation out of the Old Teſtament to diſprove *all* Titles, becauſe he acknowledges that they were *then* allowed and uſed, *outward honour having not then paſſed off.* And it's evident the good man in *Job* 31. ſpeaks not againſt *all*, but *flattering* Titles only.

Par. You told me that St. *Luke* dedicating his Goſpel to *Theophilus* ſalutes him with the Title of *Moſt Excellent*; And though *Feſtus* was a Heathen, yet St. *Paul* addreſſes himſelf to him with the Title of *Moſt Noble.* Theſe (ſays *T. E.*) *are not Titles, but Epithets.* p. 45.

Min. They are Epithets of Honour, and what are thoſe but Titles? A Term of Honour is a Title, in what part of ſpeech ſoever it is expreſt: What do's the Quaker think of [*Right Worſhipful*, and *Right Honourable?*] Do's not every body know theſe to be Titles? and yet theſe are as much Epithets, as this of [*Moſt Noble*, or *Moſt Excellent.*] And then what has this wiſe Quaker gotten by this ſubtle diſtinction?

Par, Be it *Title*, be it *Epithet*; I obſerve *T. E.* is not well pleaſed with it; for he ſays, that *the ſame* Luke *did afterwards, and to the ſame* Theophilus, *dedicate his Treatiſe of the Acts of the Apoſtles without any either Title or Epithet at all, but barely* [*O* Theophilus;] *and yet this was written after the other, in his riper years, and when he had made a further progreſs in the Chriſtian Religion; And none, I hope, will think ſo good a man went from better to worſe.* ibid.

Min.

Min. You will find in *p.* 245. of his Book, how nettled he is, that I affirmed that *the Quakers faith is as uncertain as their Teachers fansie, and that poor deluded Souls do receive falshood, railing, non-sense, and blasphemy, as if they came from the Spirit of God*, &c. I hope you see that I have already convicted this Quaker of falshood, railing, and non-sense: Now I shall charge him with Blasphemy also; For St. *Luke* was inspired with the Holy Ghost when he writ his Gospel; And suppose he might at other times be guilty of an idle or an evil word, and afterwards grow wiser and better; Yet the Holy Ghost *could not*, being infinitly perfect: So that in truth it's not St. *Luke* but the Holy Ghost, who is implicitly accused by this Quaker, at least of weakness and non-proficiency, when he gave that Title, or Epithet to *Theophilus*. St. *Basil* says, *it's a great blasphemy to affirm that there is one idle word in the Holy Scriptures* *. I pray God, my Antagonist may repent this rashness.

* Hexam. Hom. 9.

Par. As for *Paul*'s address to *Festus*, calling him *Most Noble*; he tells us that [κράτιστος] *might have been rendred most excellent.* p. 46.

Min. I grant it, for κράτιστος signifies both; So that it was as much as if he had said, *If it please your Excellency.*

Par. He says that *St.* Paul *had reason to use it to him, for in Justice and Courteous deportment he excelled all other Magistrates that* Paul *had been brought before.* ibid.

Min. Do's he commend him for Courteous deportment? that's Civil Respects *(as they are called.)*

called.) But he was so far from being either *Civil* or *Just* to St. *Paul*, that (to please the Jews) he sought to deliver him to them, by endeavouring to perswade him to go up to *Jerusalem* to be judged among them, by their Laws, to the end he might fall by their Witness and Verdict. *Acts* 25. 9, 10, 11. But let us consider when, and upon what occasion he gave him this superlative Title.

Par. That is mention'd, *Acts* 26. 24. It was in reply to *Festus* saying *with a loud voice, Paul, thou art beside thy self, Much Learning has made thee mad.*

Min. I pray, do you remember, what answer a Quaker lately gave to one, who urged this example of St. *Paul* for Civil Titles?

Par. Yes, he said, *Perhaps Noble was his Christian Name*: But why do you remind me of this?

Min. To let you see that *Ellwood*'s evasion is no less ridiculous; For he might as well have said (as his Brother Quaker did) that *Noble* is the *Christian Name of an Heathen*, as that St. *Paul* gave this Epithet to *Festus* for his justice and courtesie, when he call'd him Mad man. However you may hence infer, that call but this Quaker Mad man, tell him that he is besides himself, and then for the *courtesie*, perhaps for the *justice* thereof (even in his own sentence) you will merit the Epithet of Most Excellent.

Par. You told me that *Paul* and *Barnabas* said *Sirs*, &c. *Acts* 14. 15. *The place*, T. E. says,

ſays, *is miſrenderd*; *It ought to be* Men, &c. *p.* 47.

Min. The Greek word is not Ἀνθρωποι, but Ἄνδρες, which (as he ſays) *Beza* did rightly tranſlate, *viri*. Now let me tell our Critick, that the Greeks ever diſtinguiſhed between ἀνθρωπος, which only ſignifies the humane nature in common, and ἀνὴρ which denotes manlineſs and courage. Πολλοὶ Ἄνθρωποι, ὀλίγοι δ' Ἄνδρες, *Multi quidem Homines, pauci viri.* * *Homo ab humo*, denoting mortality; *vir a viribus*, denoting proweſs and courage; according to that excellent ſaying of *Seneca*, *Non ſentire mala non eſt Hominis, Non ferre non eſt Viri.* This may ſuffice to juſtifie our Tranſlators.

* Herod in Polymn.

Sen. de Conſul.

But though it be Ἄνδρες here, yet we find that *Mary* ſaluted him whom ſhe took for the Gardiner, *Joh.* 20. 15. by the title of Κύριε, in *Beza*'s Latine *Domine*, in Engliſh *Sir* or *Maſter*. The like did the devout Jaylor to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts* 16. 30. Yet did neither Chriſt, nor the Apoſtles, reprove them for it, being the uſual civility of that Age.

Si Nomen non occurrit, *Dominos* ſalutamus. Sen.

But ſuppoſe my Argument had miſt the mark it aim'd at (which it has not;) yet it cannot be denied to have hit another, namely, a vindication of human Learning, even from my Antagoniſt's own practice, who by the help thereof appeals from the Tranſlation to the Original: I hope he will not ſay that *he did it wholly by the Spirit*; If he do, believe him not.

Par.

Par. I ſhall not be ſo ready hereafter to believe pretences, as I have been; But to your other inſtance of Saint *John* writing
2 Joh. v. 1. *to the Elect Lady*, &c. T. E. anſwers, *Who ſhe was, and in what relation* John *ſtood to her, or how far her temporal power might extend, do's not appear.* ibid.

Min. He is in the right, The relation he ſtood to her in do's not appear; *therefore* a Title may be given, where there is not even ſo much as an *appearance* of any relation.

Par. Lady (he ſays) *ſignifies no more than Miſtreſs or Dame.* ibid.

Min. Miſtreſs, Dame and *Lady* are all expreſt by the Latin word *Domina*, and by the Greek word Κυρία; though in common uſage they be diſtinguiſht: But ſuppoſe it no more than *Miſtreſs* or *Dame*, the Quaker will gain little by the plot; For Saint *John* was her guide and Inſtructer, and ſurely that great Apoſtle ſtood in no relation of ſervitude to her, and had no temporal Office under her; If ſo, then you may collect from hence, that (according to this Quaker) its lawful (without the appearance of ſuch relation he talks of) to call a Woman *Miſtreſs*, but not a Man *Maſter*.

Par. I pray you, ſeeing T. E. trades ſo much in *Beza*, Has he no note upon this place?

Min. Yes, having tranſlated it *Domina*, he adds this ingenuous Note; *For neither do's the Chriſtian Religion reject ſuch lawful Titles,*

as

as far as it is just and equal; So that it is as if he had written TO THE LADY OF EMINENT DIGNITY*.

* Neque enim ab ejusmodi honestis Titulis Christiana Religio abhorret, quatenus quidem justum ac fas est. Perinde est igitur ac si scriptum esset, *Eximiæ ac præstanti dignitati Dominæ.*

Par. St. *John writing to Gaius* (T. E. says) *He do's not call him Rabbi or Mr.* Gaius, *but simply says, The Elder to the well beloved* Gaius. ibid.

Min. I never heard that *Gaius* was one of the Rabbies, or a Person of Quality above the Common people: If so, no wonder, St. *John* gave him no Title.

Par. But he concludes his remarks upon St. *John* thus: *If therefore the Priest will have it that* John *gave the Title of Lady in Complement only, let him prove it.* ibid.

Min. By his good leave, the Priest neither writ, nor thought any such thing: The Priest believes that St. *John* gave the Title in truth and sincerity, as answerable to her Quality. But is this ingenuous of the Quaker from a supposition of his own making, to put me upon proving what I never affirmed?

Par. You said, *Sarah* was commended not only for obeying *Abraham*, but calling him Lord: To this he answers, *Abraham had a Lordship or Power over her, as he was her Husband; here was Government and subjection, for Lord or Master (which imports the same) was a relative title to it.* p. 48.

Min. If he means, the Husband hath such a Despotick power over his Wife, as to make her stand in the same relation to him with his Servants, This will not be granted; for the subjection of the Wife is of a more ingenuous

nuous sort. Indeed the Jewish Doctors affirmed Men to have a real Lordship over their Concubines, because they took them without the solemnity of Law; as our Quakers do their Women, who yet are still in worse circumstances; for thereby their children are incapable of inheriting their Fathers Estates, and themselves of having any advantage by Dower or Alimony. Let this suffice for a Caveat to Women, how they adventure on Quakers.

As for his reflexions upon the Government and Polity of our Church, with which he concludes his Chapter of Civil Respects; I shall in his own terms tell you, that *it is an old and over-worn objection*, long since baffled and confuted by the Learned pens of the incomparable Mr. *Hooker* and Bishop *Sanderson*; and of late by the Author of the *Friendly Debates*, and by Mr. *Falkner* in a good Book call'd *Libertas Ecclesiastica*; to which I shall refer you for satisfaction.

Now I shall leave it to the consideration of all sober men, Whether of these two is more Christian, To add a *Title* to a Name, or an *Adjunct*, A Title to express our Civility and Charity, or an Adjunct to express malice, revenge, and bitterness?

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of Confeſſion.

PAR. *T.E.* tells his Readers, that *from contending for empty Titles, you come to Confeſſion of ſin; and that* (in his own opinion) *not without reaſon, becauſe you defend ſuch vain, flattering and untrue words as* (he ſays) *Titles are.* p, 50.

Min. I doubt not but the unprejudic'd Reader, who has obſerv'd how this Quaker has proved himſelf truly guilty of that whereof he unjuſtly accuſes me, will judge it more reaſonable for *him*, than *me*, to come to Confeſſion, if his pride would ſuffer him; but he is ſo far from it, that he writes againſt it, as if he were one that needed no repentance.

Par. Yet he owns it *the duty of every humble Penitent to confeſs his ſins.* p. 51.

Min. Either then *T.E.* is no *humble penitent, or neglects his duty.*

Par. But (he ſays) *the queſtion is, whether a conſtant courſe of Confeſſion be a duty?* ibid.

Min. No good man ever made a queſtion of it; Indeed thoſe Hereticks, the *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts* did: And you ſhall hear what anſwer they had from the Holy Fathers of the Church; *Confeſs always* (ſaith St. *Auguſtine*) *for thou haſt always matter to confeſs.* * *He is taught that he ſins daily, who is commanded to pray daily for the remiſſion of his ſins*, ſaith St. *Cyprian on the Lords Prayer*, who lived 250 years after Chriſt. *Therefore thou muſt daily ſay this Prayer*

* Aug. in Pſ. 99.

Prayer (saith St. *Ambrose*) *that thou may'st daily ask pardon for thine Offences?* †

† Ambr. de Sacram. lib. 6. c. 5. *See also* Tertul. de Orat. 132. & August. de Temp. Serm. 126.

And that the publick Prayers of the Primitive Christians had always a Form of Confession in them, is what all the Ancient Liturgies do manifest. This is according to the practice of the Servants of God in all Ages. *David* was far from the temper of a Quaker, who professes that he *will declare his iniquity, and be sorry for his sin. Ps.* 38. 18. And confesses that *his sins are more in number than the hairs of his head. Ps.* 40. 15.

The lower a Christian is in his own thoughts, the higher he is in God's favour. Let then this *Perking Pharisee* tell God, that he is not as other men are, and that he has *no sin to confess, unless he belie himself*; God grant, I may follow the example of the humble and penitent Publican in my Prayers to God, *to be merciful to me a sinner.*

Par. But *T. E.* says, *a constant course of confession implies a constant course of Sinning.* ibid.

Min. I answer, 1. Confession of sins past implies no such thing: Some Authors report, that St. *Peter* rose betimes every Morning to weep for the denial of his Master. 2. A constant general confession of our being sinners implies no wilful course of sin, but the quite contrary in them that do it sincerely, *viz.* a constant sight and sense of it, a constant sorrow for it, a constant desire, and endeavour to reform it. This we deny not, that such Confession implies daily need of Mercy; but then this is

no

no more, than what becomes the beſt of men, while even ſuch do find themſelves not yet deliver'd from all infirmity. *Bradford*, whom the Quaker himſelf acknowledges an Eminent Martyr, uſed in his confeſſion to ſay, *Thou art Heaven, and I am Hell.* We are ſure the Quakers have the diſeaſe of ſin, as well as others, but alas! not the ſame hope of Cure, becauſe they will not ſee the need they have of a Phyſitian. Mat. 9. 12.

Par. Now the queſtion is, Whether it be our Duty from day to day, &c. to confeſs that we are ſtill guilty of thoſe ſins, which by God's Grace we have forſaken, and which God hath forgiven us? ibid.

Min. 'Tis our Duty, no queſtion, to confeſs our ſins, after we are perſwaded that we have forſaken them, and have obtained the pardon of them.

Confeſſion is a general Duty commanded in Scripture, without limitation: Do's not *David* confeſs his ſins, *Pſal.* 51? Which (as appears by the Title of the Pſalm) was after that *Nathan* had already aſſured him from the mouth of God, that his ſin was pardoned; Elſewhere he confeſſes and begs the pardon of his ſins long ſince committed and reformed, *viz. the ſins of his youth*; Pſal. 25. 7. *Remember not the ſins of my youth.* Now let the Quaker ſpeak out, and ſay in his Style to *David*, *This confeſſion of thine is an untruth which I am ſure is no Man's duty.* 2 Sam. 12. 13.

Par. Some among the Corinthians before their Converſion had been Fornicaters, Idolaters,

ters, Adulterers, &c. Paul *says to those Corinthians, Ye are washed,* &c. *Had it been the Duty of these Corinthians, after they were thus washed to have said, we are such still? We are Fornicators still,* &c. *This would have been the way to have made them lyars still.* p. 52.

Min. What a pitiful piece of Sophistry is this? Might they not for all that have said in reference to the time past, that they *had* sinned by Fornication, by Idolatry, *&c.* Have pardoned sinners no reason to grieve, and accuse themselves any longer, than till they think, they have gained their pardon? Yes surely, they have a new occasion, a greater reason than they had before, a higher instance of the goodness of God, to engage them to renew their repentance, than they had at first to lead them to it; while they sadly consider, how good a God they offended, a God so Good, as upon their Reformation to forgive them.

But then let *Ellwood* shew, where the Church of *England* makes any publick Confession in the *Present tense*? They run in the *Preter-perfect tense*; as, *We* have *erred and strayed, &c. We* have *offended,* &c. and in the publick they are always General. Now where is the untruth? May not the most perfect Man in the World say all this?

Par. But you still call your selves *miserable sinners.*

Min. That he and all may see, *it is our judgment only* thus to confess, *I shall here* (in *Ellwood*'s own form * *produce a very authentick Witness,* Basil *Sirnamed the Great*; Who advi-

* p. 115.

sing

ſing to Confeſſion of ſin hath theſe expreſſions, *Though thou knoweſt no wicked thing by thy ſelf, thou oughteſt to ſay thus; I truly, O Lord, am not worthy to ſpeak to thee, becauſe I am a grievous ſinner; for there is none free from ſin but God alone.* Conſtit. Exercit.

We are all in the conſtruction of the Law *Miſerable ſinners*; and ſhould be found ſo, if God ſhould Arraign us at his Tribunal, and try us by the rigour of it: *David* has told us as much, *Pſal.* 103. 2. *Enter not into Judgment with thy Servant, O Lord, for in thy ſight ſhall no Man living be juſtified,* The leaſt obliquity from, or falling ſhort of the abſolute perfection of the Divine Law being enough to render us *Sinners*, and to make matter of Confeſſion.

He that has but once offended may ever after juſtly deſerve the name of *Sinner*: A regenerate Man is conſcious of having committed *ſins*, though he be not guilty of the preſent Dominion of *any*; The fact done cannot be undone. A Heathen could ſay, *Ne non peccaram, Mors quoque non faciat* * * Ovid.

But after all this I muſt ask our confident Quaker, 1. How he is infallibly certain, he has obtain'd to an abſolute unſinning ſtate of Perfection? For he muſt grant that he ought to confeſs, and ask pardon, till he be infallibly certain of his being pure from all ſin, and without all ſpot and blemiſh, as pure as *Adam* before he fell, as the Angels in Heaven, and the Spirits of juſt men made perfect; for he muſt grant that he ought to confeſs and ask forgive-

neſs of all, even the leaſt Moral weakneſſes, and all defects of Obedience, whereby he falls ſhort in the ſmalleſt degree of the abſolute perfection of the Law, until he is thus ſure his performances are without all defect, and himſelf without all infirmity. And is *T. E.* indeed ſure he is ſo? and do's he know the hour and minute when he firſt arrived to this ſtate, and might take confidence to conclude of his abſolute perfection? But if neither we nor he himſelf be ſure of this, or of the poſſibility of it, I think 'tis very ſafe for us to continue the Confeſſion of ſin, yea and for him too, leſt perhaps he ſhould be miſtaken, and in ſome ſmall degree be yet imperfect. For as there is little danger of his diſpleaſing God by any exceſs of humility in the continuance of ſuch confeſſion, though he were really arrived to ſuch a perfection; ſo on the other ſide in the Caſe of our State towards God, there being a great deal of danger in our miſtaking, I think it is good for him to conſider of it, and for us to go on in our courſe of Confeſſion till we be ſure.

2. I muſt alſo ask him, how he infallibly knows, that all his ſins are for ever pardon'd? for I ſuppoſe he will grant that he ought to confeſs and to ask forgiveneſs, till he be ſure of a pardon.

Par. He will ſay, he knows they are forgiven, becauſe he hath forſaken them.

Min. That indeed is the beſt ground of hope (if he have it;) but not ſuch as to make Fear or Confeſſion needleſs: For ſeeing Firſt, according

cording to his own aſſertion † the ſtate of the beſt and moſt perfect Men here is not immutable, but that they may fall from it: Secondly, ſeeing perſeverance to the end is a neceſſary condition of final pardon, and ſalvation; it will follow, that though *T. E.* were perfect, yet it were not at all improper for him to confeſs, and ask forgiveneſs of his former ſins, becauſe (according to his own Principles) he is not ſure, but he may fall into ſin again, which may cauſe his pardon to be revoked: And as there is no danger of diſpleaſing God (as is ſaid before) in any exceſs of humility in theſe Confeſſions; ſo the practice of this humility, and the ſight and ſenſe of our former ſins is a very expedient, and indeed a neceſſary means to preſerve us from falling into ſin again. For *this is that* (ſaith St. *Bernard*) *which makes it neceſſary for us to be ſolicitous with fear and trembling, and always humbling our ſelves under the Mighty hand of God, ſince though we can know in part what we are, yet it is utterly impoſſible for us to know what we ſhall be.* Finally then, ſince our ſin is *certain*, our pardon *conditional*, our Enemies *vigilant*, and we *frail*; whatever *Ellwood* thinks of himſelf, We think, we ought to call and eſteem our ſelves *Miſerable ſinners*, till God upon our perſeverance hath ſealed our abſolute pardon.

† p. 68.

Serm 1. in Septuageſ.

Par. Is there but one Leſſon (ſays *T. F.*) *for all degrees?* p. 53.

Min. Yes, there are ſeveral Leſſons for ſeveral States of Men, but this Leſſon ſuits them all. This Confeſſion, like thoſe of the Primi-

tive Church being design'd for the publick (where are Men of all degrees, Children, young men and Fathers) is made in such general terms, that all may joyn in it: The particulars we leave to every Mans Conscience, and to his Closet to supply: But since we all agree in this, to live together in a miserable, sinful World; and we all have sinned, and (as *T. E.* acknowledges) we all *may* sin; therefore it is not unreasonable, we should all agree to confess that we are miserable sinners: If this will not suffice; Let *Elwood* use his captious question to St. *Paul*, O *Paul*, *dost thou say thou art the chief of sinners? thou wast so at thy first coming into this School; What? No proficiency, no improvement? No going forward? After thou hast spent thy Age in this School, if we measure thee by thine own Confession, thou art not one step nearer thy Journeys end; no whit better, than* * p.53. *when thou camest first in, and therefore worse.* *

Par. But to conclude this Subject, *T. E.* tels us, *It is not the duty of any Man, to propose to himself a constant and common Course of Confession, because whosoever do's so, must first propose to himself a constant and common course of sinning.* p. 54.

Min. That which is lawful and fit to be used (as I have proved Confession to be, till we have persevered, and be absolutely perfect without all infirmity) is lawful to be proposed to Mens practice; and may be so, without any proposing to our selves a common course of sinning, because the proposal of this course of Confession most properly proceeds from a contrary

contrary cauſe, *viz.* from the conſideration of our infirmity and mutability, from humility, a pious fear †, prudence and ſenſe of duty. Therefore the Quaker's Pride and Scoffing ſhall not make us out of love with the Medicine, that God hath provided for us. *It may ſhame us* (ſays *Tertullian* *) *that we ſin again, but to repent when we have ſinned ſhould not ſhame us.* We have another kind of Judge than *Ellwood*, who ſees our hearts, and will account with him for his malicious cenſure of our Penitence, and of the devout and Orthodox Conſtitutions of our Church: So that my Adverſary has taken much pains here to prove himſelf not only *weak* but *wicked*. And truly I am apt to believe, that in this abuſe of Piety, and ſo neceſſary a Duty, as Confeſſion is, *T. E.* is too much a *Socinian* to pleaſe all, even of his own party, or any Man that is conſiderate; And I wiſh the Quakers would at laſt open their eyes, to ſee by what ſeducers they are led, that at length they may withdraw from them, and make choice of more upright, more orthodox, and ſafer Guides.

† Rom. 11.20.

*Tert. de Pœnit.

CHAP V.

Of Perfection.

Par. WHAT Ground *T.E.* has loſt in his Four firſt Chapters will ſurely be regained in his Fifth of Perfection, *a Doctrine which* (he ſays) *has not met with oppoſition from the hands of moſt ſorts of Men, ſince the time it was firſt Preacht in this later Age of the World.* P. 54.

Min. If the *oldeſt* things in Religion be beſt, then the *neweſt* muſt needs be the worſt: But if it will not make the Quaker too proud, I will tell him, that his Doctrine of Perfection is of greater Antiquity then he is willing to allow it; For it was Preacht before the latter Age of the World: And if it pleaſe him to look again into *Goodwin*'s *Antiquities*, and particularly into that inſtance he gives me of the *ſeven ſorts of Phariſees*, he will find that one ſort of them were called *quid debeo facere & faciam illud*, from their boaſting of a perfect power to keep the Law; And that Author thinks, that the young man mention'd *Luk.* 18.21. was of this Order: So that *Elwood* might have learnt, that the Phariſees were Quakers in this Point, yet Hypocrites in Chriſt's account: And upon a further ſearch into this Controverſie, I find this Doctrine much ancienter than I thought, when we firſt diſcourſt it; For the *Gnoſtick* Hereticks, and particularly that herd of them called the *Valentinians*,

tinians, did exalt themſelves, calling themſelves *Perfect*, ſaith *Epiphanius*. After them the *Novatians* call'd themſelves *Cathari*, *i.e.* Pure. *But thoſe who call themſelves pure* (ſaith the ſame Epiph.) *are confuted by their own words; for whoſoever doth call himſelf Pure, doth perfectly condemn himſelf, that he is Impure.* Next after them the *Pelagian* Hereticks held, that a Man may be without ſin: Which the Holy *Auguſtine* confutes by many of the ſame Arguments, which this Quaker derides me for uſing. And *Celeſtinus* the *Pelagian* uſed ſuch falſe *Mediums*, as his Friend *Ellwood* has ſtoln from him to juſtifie this Doctrine: and this may be ſeen in that Book which he writ againſt him.

Epiph. hær. 31. Anno. 193.

Hæreſ. 59 Anno 440.

Epiſt. 89.

Now will this bold Quaker tell theſe Orthodox Fathers, who oppoſed this notion of Perfection, that ſome *through ignorance miſtook it, others through intereſt reviled and gainſayed it, as foreſeeing it deſtructive to their Trade and profit*, &c? As he tells his Reader, *p.* 55.

Aug. de perfec. Inſtit. Edit. Erafm. Tom. 7.

Par. I perceive then this Doctrine of Perfection was condemned for Heretic by the Holy Fathers of the Church: But did not the Quakers firſt broach this Opinion in theſe later Ages?

Min. Quakeriſm it ſelf cannot plead the preſcription of One Age. But this Doctrine was Preacht by the Popiſh Fryars as a Foundation for their Merits and Works of ſupererogation: The wild Anabaptiſts about 140 years ago, pretended alſo to Perfection: And 'it's the *Socinian* Doctrine, *that we may perfectly fulfil the*

Law

Law of God. But all Orthodox Proteſtants ever oppoſed theſe Men, as much as I do the Quakers herein; who may go and boaſt, that they have the Phariſees, the old Hereticks, the wild Anabaptiſts, and the Socinians on their ſide in this matter; whilſt we (by Gods Grace) do, and will hold the conſtant Doctrine of the Catholick Church.

Par. You have ſaid enough to make me aware of this Quaker; who wonders that you *ſhould own Perfection*, and yet *deny it to be an unſinning State*: Therefore he asks, *What kind of notion you have got of Perfection, who would be perfect, yet a ſinner?* ibid.

Min. Seeing I believe, you ſincerely deſire to be inform'd; and withal T.E. (as you cannot but obſerve) is ſo unconſtant to his own aſſertions, and confuſed in his notions of Perfection; and the right fixing the notion of things being neceſſary in order to the clear proceeding in affirming, or denying any thing concerning them; I will digreſs a little to ſtate the Caſe, and that in three particulars: By which many of my Adverſarie's objections will fall without taking any further notice of them. We ſhall therefore conſider,

1. What is meant by Perfection; and what is to be granted or denyed concerning it.

2. Whether the beſt of Men can attain ſuch a Perfection, as that they need not, or ought not to acknowledge themſelves ſinners and Offenders?

3. What is the reſult, tendency and conſequent of aſſerting, or denying ſuch a Perfection.

Par.

Par. I ſhall be very glad to have a juſt account of theſe particulars.

Min. I begin with the *firſt*. It's very evident that *Perfection* or *being Perfect*, is taken in different ſenſes in Holy Scripture, ſometimes in a *Poſitive* ſenſe, and ſometimes in a *Comparative*.

A *poſitive Perfection* is that, which includes ſuch a compleatneſs, wherein nothing is wanting or deficient to the anſwering and coming up to thoſe meaſures, by which it is to be judged and examined. Now the meaſures by which the Perfection of Men muſt be judged of, are of two ſorts,

Firſt, The Capacity of our Nature taken in its beſt and ſinleſs eſtate, and the holy and perfect Law of God, to which it is in every reſpect exactly conformable; And hence the firſt ſenſe of Perfection is, when a Man is in a ſtate of enjoying as great good and ſatisfaction, and as high purity and freedom from all ſtain of evil, as either the Nature of Man can arrive unto, or as the perfect Law of God do's require. This was our ſtate in Paradiſe, and will be in Heaven; This is the Perfection ſpoken of 1 *Cor.* 13. 10. and probably *Eph.* 4. 13. *Heb.* 12. 23. and elſewhere.

The ſecond Meaſure by which a Man's Perfection is to be judged of, is the capacity of our Nature ſince the fall, and the terms which the Goſpel Covenant preſcribeth, and the Mercy of God accepteth: Hence the ſecond ſenſe of Perfection is, when a Man lives as holily as ever he can in this frail eſtate; ſincerely ſtriving

to

to do all Christian duties, and to avoid all sin; and supplying his failings by Faith and Repentance; So that God accepts him upon the terms of the Gospel as perfectly righteous, in and through Christ: This may be call'd *Evangelical Perfection*; and is spoken of *Heb.* 10. 14. and 13. 21. *Jam.* 3. 2. And this is oft exprest by the *Perfect heart*; And in this sense [*Perfect*] is opposed to [*Wicked*] *Job.* 9. 22. and is explain'd by *being upright*. *Psal.* 37. 37. And this may be consistent with some failings.

That there are two measures of Perfection, appears by that instance I gave you of St. *Paul*; who acknowledges himself *Perfect* according to one measure, and yet *not perfect* according to another, *Phil.* 3. 12, and 15. compared. So according to this second measure, and God's gracious acceptance, *Asa*'s heart is said to have been *perfect all his days*, 1 *King.* 15. 14. yet came he far short of a sinless perfection; For *the high places were not taken away*, ibid. And he was sinfully passionate against *Hanani*, 2 *Chron.* 16. 10. Who did but his Office in reproving him for relying on the King of *Syria*, *ver.* 7 And being lame on his feet *sought not to the Lord, but to the Physicians*, *ver.* 12. Now let *Ellwood*, ask, what Notion the Holy Ghost has of Perfection, who records *Asa* both *perfect* and a *sinner*? Therefore upon the account of this second sense of Perfection, the Hebrew word for *perfect* is by our Translators often render'd *upright*, and made use of to express the necessary qualification for obtaining God's favour, *Psal.*

Pſal. 15. 2. compared with *ver.* 1, 5. and *Pſal.* 18. 23. Elſewhere it is expreſt by *a heart that is ſound in God's Statutes*; and made to be a ground of ſure hope and confidence in God's mercy. *Pſal.* 119. 80. Yea, the Hebrew word ſignifying perfection is tranſlated *ſincerity*, *Joſ.* 24. 14. which *T.E.* ſeems to deny, *p.* 72. This for the Poſitive ſenſe of Perfection.

The next ſenſe of Perfection is *Comparative*, by which is meant ſuch a Perfection, as is not exactly compleat in it ſelf in reſpect to the firſt and higheſt Meaſures, but only more compleat than ſome other, to which it is compared; And this applied to our caſe, conſiſts in outdoing the lower ſorts of Chriſtians, and coming up to the higher meaſures and degrees of knowledge and practice; and in this ſenſe Perfection is taken, *Heb.* 6. 1. 1 *Cor.* 11. 6.

Now to apply this threefold diſtinction of Perfection: The attaining a *comparative perfection* is not only deſirable, and uſeful, but poſſible; nay 'tis actually arrived to by ſome, though not by all, who notwithſtanding may be true Chriſtians.

The attaining an *Evangelical perfection* is not only poſſible, but alſo abſolutely neceſſary to all true Chriſtians.

But an *abſolute Perfection* in the firſt ſenſe (about which the diſpute lies) though it be the Crown we aim at, yet is not attain'd by any in this life: which is my next particular, of which I ſhall now give you an account.

Par. As you propounded it before, it was this, *Whether the beſt of Men can in this World attain*

tain to ſuch a perfection as they need not, or ought not to acknowledge themſelves ſinners and Offenders?

Min. To which query I reply by laying down theſe propoſitions.

Firſt, That there being two Meaſures, by which we may judge of our Perfection, Namely, the perfect and exact Law of God, and the Terms of the Goſpel Covenant; the firſt of theſe is the Rule of our Duty; the ſecond is the condition of our acceptance, which are not one and the ſame under the Goſpel: The Covenant of Grace as a Covenant requires not the firſt ſort of perfection in order to our acceptance (though the Law do's ſtill call for it;) For if it did, Salvation were impoſſible for us in our faln and frail eſtate: Yet ſtill the Goſpel is a diſpenſation of *purity* as well as *grace*, nor is it the deſign thereof to cancel our Obligation to obedience, but rather to advance it; and therefore it rejects not any Moral duty, nor allows any thing that is Morally evil; For as it cannot be, that any thing Good or Evil ſhould ceaſe to be *ſo* under the Goſpel; So it is unſuitable to the deſign of that Doctrine that eſtabliſheth God's Kingdom, to diſcharge Man from the obedience which he owes as a Creature. Whence it follows,

Secondly, That all, even the leaſt evil is a ſin, becauſe the tranſgreſſion of a Law, as well as the groſſer Acts of ſin; All evil thoughts, irregular deſires, and diſorderly paſſions, and alſo the omiſſion of the due exerciſe of good thoughts and deſires, as well as of good words and

and actions, are breaches of God's Holy Law now, incur His diſpleaſure, deſerve His wrath, and need His pardon: for Man's preſent inability to keep the Law in the rigour of it, do's by no means excuſe him of his duty to keep the whole Law; becauſe his weakneſs is the effect of his own ſin and fall, and he is accountable for it.

Thirdly, The Perfection of Practice in avoiding all evil, and performing every Duty, which God requires, ought to be endeavour'd after: yet ſuch an Abſolute ſinleſs Perfection in the whole courſe of our lives is not attain'd in this life, nor was it ever actually attain'd by any meer Man ſince the fall; which though I formerly proved to you in the *Conference*, yet will I now take more pains with you to confirm it.

Perfection is oppoſed to Moral imperfection, and ſignifies a ſtate and condition abſolutely ſinleſs in rigour of Law, ſuch as comes up to the firſt Meaſure, and our primitive Capacity before we Fell: Thus the word ought to be taken in this Controverſie; And now I ſhall tell you how far we diſpute againſt it, and this I ſhall do both Negatively and Affirmatively. *Firſt*, We do not deny it to be deſirable, for it is the matter of our higheſt aims and hopes; Nor (*Secondly*) As wholly and for ever impoſſible to us, for we believe we ſhall attain it, when we reach the Heavenly Manſions; Nor (*Thirdly*) As impoſſible for God to effect now in our preſent State, who can do every thing which implyeth not a contradiction; Nor

(*Fourthly*)

(*Fourthly*) Do we discard sincere endeavours after it; For we constantly maintain, That sincere endeavour to perfect Holiness, and to live without all manner of sin, is the Condition of Salvation: For what Divine ever affirmed it lawful to allow our selves in any sin? That therefore we Assert is as followeth;

We maintain (*First*) That the absolute perfection here explained, is not the condition of Salvation; seeing even *Babes in Christ* (who are far remote from it) may be saved. (*Secondly*) We maintain, that it is not the ordinary condition of Christians, but is to be reckoned (though not among the τὰ ἀδύνατα, things simply impossible, if God were pleas'd to use His power, yet) among the τὰ μὴ συμβαίνοντα, things that do not actually come to pass in this World, which they that please may call Morally impossible, that is, so difficult that Men will not actually arrive to it in this lower State, wherein it hath pleased God to set us: And the Grounds of our Assertion are these.

First, The many expressions of the Saints of God in Scripture, who testifie of themselves, that they were not absolutely sinless in rigour of Law; and the constant experience of the People of God, since the Scripture times. *Secondly*, The inconsistency of such perfection with the present weakness of Man's Nature, and the many deplorable circumstances, which are the consequents of his Fall. *Thirdly*, The end of Gospel Institutions, which are plainly design'd for an Imperfect State, and of no use, if it were otherwise, in the forementiond explained sense.

ſenſe. *Fourthly*, Abundance of Scriptures commanding us to grow in Grace; therefore we can never be paſt growing in this life: We muſt abound more and more. Theſe and many others ſuppoſe plainly, that we come not to our ἄκμὴ, to our ultimate perfection in this life. *Fifthly*, Thoſe Scriptures which ſhew the danger of ſtanding upon terms with God, and the miſery we are in, if God ſhould deal with us in rigour of Law: *Enter not into judgment with thy ſervant, for in thy ſight ſhall no Man living be juſtified*, Pſal. 143. 2. *If thou Lord ſhouldſt mark iniquities, O Lord who ſhall ſtand? Pſal.* 130. 3, &c. *Sixthly*, Thoſe Scriptures which ſhew our need of Mercy at death and judgment: *The Lord grant unto him, that he may find Mercy of the Lord in that Day.* 2 Tim. 1. 18, &c. *Seventhly*, We may confirm it, with reſpect to the times of the Old Teſtament, from *Lev.* 16. 6. and *Heb.* 9. 7. where *Aaron (the Saint of the Lord*)* with his Succeſſors is enjoyned yearly to offer a Sin-offering, as well *for himſelf*, as *for the errors of the people*; Which ſhews plainly, that the Saints in the Old time had not attain'd to an unſinning perfection. And with reſpect to the New Teſtament, the ſame is proved by the deſcription of the Goſpel Righteouſneſs conſiſting in having ſin pardon'd. *Rom.* 3. 6, 7, 8. *Eph.* 1. 7. 1 *Joh.* 1. 8, 9. So that after all this,

2 Pet. 3. 18. 1 Theſſ. 4. 1, &c.

* Pſ. 106. 16.

Fourthly, We ought not to be diſcouraged as to our final eſtate; becauſe this unſinning Perfection is not the terms of our acceptance with God, nor will the want of it cauſe our

final rejection: For to assert this, would make void the Covenant of Grace, which admits repentance, proposeth forgiveness, and accepts sincerity; because though it be (as I said) the design of the Gospel to prohibit all sin, and to allow none; yet if through infirmity a Man fall, it provides a Remedy, 1 *Joh.* 2. 1. And upon performance of the conditions of our acceptance, secures Salvation.

Par. I see not why Men should require more, than God is pleas'd to accept, and we in a capacity to perform: So that you need enlarge no further in the proof of these; Only let me understand, What is the result, tendency, and consequent of denying the Quakers absolute unsinning State, and asserting the Evangelical Perfection; which was your Third particular.

Min. We deny the Quakers absolute Perfection, not only as unattainable, and inconsistent with the condition of faln Man, but as it is apt to deceive some Men into a Groundless pride, to make them neglect the means of remission, despise the mercy of the Death of Jesus Christ, and rely on their own Merits; as it confounds the Covenant of Works and Grace, and as it stands as that *two-edged sword*, Gen. 3. 24. *keeping the way of the Tree of life*, and making them despair of ever attaining everlasting Glory, when they once find themselves deceived. But then there are no ill Consequents (as is falsly pretended) by our denying this absolute unsinning righteousness, or perfection.

First,

First, 'Tis no diſcouragement to Chriſtian care and diligence, and the moſt vigorous endeavours, that any Chriſtian can uſe; while he attains at preſent an Evangelical Perfection, and peace and reconciliation with God, and the favour to be owned as his child, and an heir of Glory, and of that State of abſolute Perfection in Heaven, yea and of a greater degree of Glory, according to his growth in Grace here.

Secondly, It's no Doctrine of looſeneſs, or encouragement to ſin; ſince *that* Grace, which tenders remiſſion of ſin to the ſincere and penitent, will never accept the ſlothful and careleſs: And it's ſufficiently proved, that the Goſpel gives no allowance to ſin, but promiſeth greater rewards to greater degrees of Piety.

Laſtly, The aſſerting this Evangelical Perfection hath many good conſequents: For it directs to the performance of many conſiderable Duties, which elſe would have no foundation; as the ſeeking of God's pardoning Mercy, and acknowledging that we deſerve from Him much worſe than we receive, a recourſe to the Merits of Chriſt, and applying them to our ſelves in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the practice of Confeſſion and Godly Contrition, with the exerciſes of Mortification, the duty of Humility and many other, which will have no place in *Ellwood's unſinning State*.

Theſe are our Reaſons (and it's left to you and the World, whether they be weighty or no;) why we *deny* one kind of Perfection, and *aſſert* another.

Par. I must confess with all thankfulness, that the account you have given me of Perfection is clear to me in all its senses, whereby I do not only apprehend the true State of the Case, but do perceive, the Quakers are in love with the Name [*Perfection*,] but never well consider'd what it meant: And I hope, when they see, how fully you hold an *Evangelical perfection*, and the reasons why you deny an *absolute unsinning Perfection*, they will submit to your sense thereof.

Min. But that *T. E's.* fallacies may not hinder a wished compliance; pray, do you mention, what in your opinion are the most considerable of his reflexions on our last discourse.

Par. The grand text, which the Quakers used to produce in favour of their notion of perfection, is that in *Mat.* 5. 48. *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.* Which place, you told me, St. *Luke* render'd, *Be ye therefore Merciful, as your Father also is Merciful.* And from the *Context* you told me, that *our Lord there aims only from God Almightie's example to press Charity and Mercy to the highest degree*, &c. To this *T. E.* replies, *Did he consider what he writ? or how he should be able to maintain it? He is got so high at the first step, that the Quakers had need help him down again. The highest degree of Charity and Mercy is applicable only to God Almighty*, &c. p. 56.

Luke 6. 36.

Conf. p. 31.

Min. I hope you take notice, that here's not one word in vindication of his Brethren. Is it not a wonder, that his Answer was not, *Here the Priest*

Prieſt deals diſhoneſtly with us? And that the Quakers never applied that text to ſuch a ſenſe? But you ſee he leaves the Argument, and makes it his buſineſs to play the Jack Pudding by telling his Reader, that I am *got ſo high at firſt ſtep, that the Quakers had need help me down again.* But by his good leave I ſhall need no ſuch favour from them, being without their help able to vindicate my own expreſſion; therefore I would deſire *T. E.* to conſider, that the word [*Higheſt*] is to be limited by the perſons we are ſpeaking of: As *Eccl.* 5. 8. *He that is higher than the Higheſt regardeth*, &c. *Higheſt* there ſignifies *the Higheſt among Men*: So Chriſt preſſeth Charity and Mercy to the Higheſt degree they can be acted among Men; And is this *vying perfection with the Creator*? He only ſet them the Divine Charity for a Pattern, which is the Higheſt Charity in it ſelf; and preſt them to come as near it, as their Nature was capable of, by exerciſing it in the higheſt kind, namely, by forgiving Enemies, and in imitation of the Higheſt Example. *St. Luke* call'd *Theophilus Moſt Excellent*; will the Quaker ſay, he had ſet him ſo high, as to make him excel God, or at leaſt to be Equal with him? Or was *he* got ſo high, as to ſtand in need of the Quakers to help him down?

Par, I fear, this was rather a wilful than ignorant miſtake of your Adverſarie's: And do very much wonder, that having learnt from you the diſtinction of Equality and Similitude, he ſhould tax you with the neglect of it, *ibid.*

Min. I ſhall here enquire how a dear Friend of his underſtood this diſtinction; I mean *George Fox*, who blaſphemouſly affirmed that *he was equal with God*; as it was atteſted by the Oaths of credible Witneſſes at *Lancaſter* Aſſizes: ſee the forementioned Book call'd *The Perfect Phariſee*. p. 3. Where 'tis alſo proved, that *James Naylor* with no leſs blaſphemy ſaid, that *he was as Holy, juſt, and good, as God himſelf.* Thus the Quakers talked of old, though now *Ellwood* has learnt (from the Book he oppoſes) this Diſtinction, and ſays, *They deſire their Charity and Mercy may be real, true, ſincere, of the ſame nature, kind, quality with God's; but expect it not in the ſame degree*, &c. ibid. But this is far ſhort of their former boaſtings: And therefore they who are ſo inconſiſtent with themſelves, muſt not complain that their Principles are miſ-ſtated while they have no fixed Principles, nor ſtanding Rule of Faith: For every Body knows that the Quakers are not now what they were formerly; Nor do they know themſelves what they will be the next year: The Wiſe man ſaith, *A fool changeth as the Moon*, *Eccluſ* 6. 11. So that I cannot but think of the witty Apologie of *Cleobulus*, *How the Moon came and deſired her Mother to make her a Coat fit for her*; to which ſhe replied, *Alas! how can I do it? for thou art ſometimes full and round, ſometimes ſmall and horned, again only half full*, &c. This is my task in this Diſpute; while *T.E.* hath ſet up a Notion of Perfection, ſo different from the uſual opinion of his Brethren.

Cauſin. parab. hiſt. l. 2. c. 14.

Par.

Par. Indeed the Proverb is, *They never chose well, that change so often*; yet if *T. E.* bring the Quakers nearer to Truth, I would not have you discourage him: And I fancy he has yielded much of his Cause in the definition he gives of Perfection; Which (he says) *is to aim at, and press after a State of being in this life deliver'd from sin, and by the mighty Power of God preserved from the act, commission, and guilt of sin*; *this*, he says, *is that they mean by Perfection*, p. 57.

Min. Not heeding the Tautologies of this description, we will come to the definition it self: where I must desire you to take notice, that after all his boasting of an *unsinning State*, p. 55. though he blames me for interpreting Pertection in several places of Scripture to mean no more than *sincerity*, p. 70. here he defines it to be only the *aiming at and pressing after such a State*. Now consider, I pray, that he that is *aiming*, has not *hit* the Mark as yet; he that is *pressing* after such a State, has not yet *attain'd* to it; This is not that absolute Perfection, which the Quakers used to pretend to: And St. *Paul* concluded that he was not already Perfect, because he had not already *attained*, and was but *pressing towards the Mark*, Phil. 3. 12, 13, 14. *Perfectum est cui nihil deest*: He that is strictly perfect, wants nothing; but he that is aiming and pressing after, would have something that he wants. Arist. Phys. lib. 3.

Finally, *Ellwood* has brought his Perfection to signifie no more, than sincere Endeavours to be free from Sin; and thus much we yield and

preſs. *We are perfect Travellers* (as ſaith St. *Auguſtine*) *not perfect poſſeſſors*; and our Perfection is capable of increaſe: For *no Man is perfect* (ſaith St. *Bernard*) *who deſires not to be ſtill more perfect*, &c. But if this be all the Quakers Perfection, they are but like their Neighbours; and is it not unreaſonable, that *T. E.* ſhould diſpute againſt his own definition? I wiſh he and his Brethren would ſtand to this ſenſe of perfection; for then we ſhould be agreed as to this point: but I fear from what follows, the Quaker thinks that he had overſhot himſelf; and his Brethren perhaps will charge him to have betrayed their Cauſe.

Bern. Epiſt.

Par. I doubt as much; for *p.* 59. he infers not only a poſſibility of living without ſin, but in the next page he is expreſly for an *unſinning State*, affirming that the commands for it are *plainly produced*: Now indeed one would think, if God command us to be perfectly free from all ſin, there might be ſome, who in this life are truly ſo; becauſe he commands no impoſſibility.

Min. This is an uſual fallacy with *T. E.* eſpecially in *p.* 96, 97. to argue from the *Precept* to the *Performance*; and falſly to ſuppoſe, that ſome Men are *actually and abſolutely perfect*; becauſe we are commanded to endeavour and preſs after *our being ſo*: But St. *Auguſtin*'s Anſwer to *Celeſtinus* the *Pelagian* on the ſame occaſion, will ſuffice to ſhew the ſophiſtry of this pretence; *Thoſe exhortations, by which we are commanded to be Perfect, do not ſo much ſhew what we Are, as what we Ought to be.*

The

The Law indeed ſtill demands Perfect Obedience, though we are utterly unable to perform it; and this moſt righteouſly, becauſe it is not God, but our ſelves who are the cauſes of our own inability; It is the effect of our own ſin; and therefore both our Obedience to the whole Law, and all our primitive Righteouſneſs, which we had before the *Fall*, are by the Law juſtly required of us. But then the Goſpel Covenant in Jeſus Chriſt, who has ſatisfied the rigour of the Law for us, requires no ſuch thing, as neceſſary to Salvation, of us; though it requires our utmoſt endeavours after it; as has been ſaid.

Par. I produced the inſtances of *Noah*, *Job*, and *David*, who had actually attained this State of Perfection; But in regard you proved, that as to matter of fact they were all guilty of ſin; I was ſatisfied that their Perfection could not mean an unſinning State, or a State of freedom from all ſin: But *T. E.* is not ſo perſwaded, but replies, that *to blemiſh Noah's Perfection you object, that he was drunk and uncovered in his Tent; And that he walked with God before this, and after this alſo; and while he was in his ſin, he did not walk with God*, &c. p. 61.

Min. I ſuppoſe *your* deſign was to find out the Truth, as *his* is to cavil, and darken it; Therefore he will ſpeak abſurdly rather than ſay nothing. If it was ill done in me to mention the failings of *Noah*, *Job*, and *David* (as he ſuggeſts;) Do's not he alſo blaſphemouſly accuſe the Holy Ghoſt for recording it? However this I am ſure of, that this inſtance ſhews

Noah's

Noah's Perfection to be such, that he needed pardon, and that his life was not all of a piece, not free from all stain of sin; And the Quaker's rare discovery amounts to no more than this; *Noah* was perfect, while he did not sin, that is, *while he was perfect, he was perfect*: wonderful!

Par. I would have you answer this more fully; for I perceive he is not a little pleased with this Device, but relies much upon it; And for *Job*, he conceives that *it cannot be fairly infer'd, that he was not deliver'd and kept from sin in the precedent and subsequent parts of his life*, p. 64. And of *David* he says, that *he was not a Man after God's own heart*, &c. *while he was guilty of sin*; and that *when he was after God's own heart, he was free from it*, p. 69. And he grows mighty big, and thinks, *if it be possible to attain* the State of Perfection, *it is not impossible to retain it; for the same Divine Power that brings a Man to it, is equally able to preserve him in it*; and *if it be possible for a Man to be preserved in this State an Hour, it is not impossible to be preserved a Day; if a Day, a Year; if a Year, an Age*, p. 68.

Min. The notion this Quaker has got of Perfection will amount to no more than this, that a Man may be perfect at Morning, fall at Noon, and be Perfect again at Night. This perfect Man of his mindeth me of *Mercury* in *Homer*; *Who was born in the Morning, invented Musick at Noon, and stole* Apollo's *Oxen* at Night. I thought perfection had been a State and Condition absolutely sinless, and inconsistent

ſiſtent with Relapſes into ſin. I'm ſure, I may more juſtly argue thus; The Saints have ſinned Once, and therefore may ſin Twice, and conſequently Many times; They have the ſame Enemies without, and propenſities within: And for all *T. E.*'s fallacious Argument, 'tis not ſo probable, that a Good man ſhall abſtain from ſin a *whole Year*, as it is, he ſhall abſtain from ſin *one Day*, much leſs *an Hour*; becauſe the mind cannot be ſo long fixt and intent to avoid the innumerable occaſions of *Falling*: I can keep awake one Night, but not many; not therefore a Week, or a Year, or an Age: yet by *Ellwood*'s Argument, we may ſtand in a Poſture for ever.

Par. But cannot God's mighty Power keep us as well an Age, as an Hour from ſin?

Min. We are not diſputing what God *can* do, but what he ſees *fit* to do, and what he *actually* doth: Let him prove *de facto*, that God uſeth His irreſiſtible Power in this Caſe; and that *actually* He hath ſo preſerved *any* Man. I doubt the Quaker muſt be forced here to leave the Scriptures, and go to the Popiſh Legend, to prove that *Bonaventure* never committed any ſin in his whole life; which ſtory has as little of Truth in it, as *Ellwood*'s Argument has of ſolid Reaſon. Finally, if *T. E.* can go no higher than to prove, The Saints are perfect, only while they do not ſin; And that the Divine power *can* preſerve them from ſin for an Age together; All this may be ſaid of Sinners, who yet are no more perfect, then is his Diſcourſe.

Par.

Par. But *T. E.* ſays, *If in this life freedom from ſin be not attainable, when and where is it? At Death leaves, Judgment finds*, p. 91.

Min. 'Tis true, as death leaves, Judgment will find us, as to the general State of Regeneracy or Unregeneracy; but this is far from being true concerning all perfections or imperfections of Body or Soul, and many other things relating to the State of the whole Man: The Body, which dying is Gorruptible, will not be ſuch when raiſed again; The Aſſaults of Satan, and Allurements from various objects, both men and things in the World, after departure hence, have no place. He that to the time of death lived by Faith with reſpect to things above, will then have a more preſent ſight of another World, and the State of Happineſs, and of the Glorious Majeſty of God, and our Saviour: Nor will his State then be (as here it is unto death) ſubject to wearineſs and dulneſs, and ſuch imperfections, whereby he is here oft indiſpoſed for conſtant vigorous actions, and ſuch compleat perfection of holineſs, as by his Original ſtrength Man was able to exerciſe before his fall, and which therefore in the ſtrictneſs of the Divine Law is ſtill required of him, and the leaſt defect whereof is therefore ſinful, and hath need of that Pardon purchaſed for us by Jeſus Chriſt. Now, as to that State of abſolute Perfection without Spot, and that *Prize of the High Calling* which true Chriſtians preſs after, and hope aſſuredly to arrive to hereafter, there is a great

Acceſſion

Acceſſion in order hereunto, when the perſon, whoſe heart was truly Upright, becomes freed from all the imperfections and infirmities of this Low eſtate, and out of the reach of all temptations and aſſaults of Enemies, and all allurements to evil; and where he is affected with the fulleſt ſenſe of the higheſt Good, which are the moſt powerful motives to determine his Actions; and his Soul (and in the Reſurrection his Body alſo) ſhall be fitted and ſtrengthen'd to the moſt conſtant and vigorous actions of compleat Perfection, and act under the higher ſupplies of Influence from God, together with the Advantage of the Heavenly Society of God, Angels, and Saints, in that State where God will fulfil all Promiſes which relate to Happineſs. And when perfection in knowledge and Incorruption, and the moſt excellent State of Soul and Body, both with reſpect to their Actions, Capacities of enjoying perfection of State, and the being immediately poſſeſſed of the Higheſt Good, are none of them fully enjoyed in this life; what pretence can reaſonably be made againſt the then entring into the moſt abſolute Perfection of Purity?

Par. Your inſtance of *Job*'s confeſſing that he had ſinned, *T. E.* ſays, *ſpeaks of the time paſt not preſent*, p. 62.

Min. He might in this Confeſſion mean ſome ſin or ſins newly committed (either in thought or word, through weakneſs in this preſent State of Imperfection;) And this would require the Præter-perfect tenſe, as well as ſins committed long ſince. But one thing here I would

would have you to take notice of, That according to *Ellwood's* own ſenſe which he gives of this paſſage, Here is *Job* a *perfect man* (one therefore whoſe ſins were all pardon'd and forſaken, yet) confeſſing his ſins; yea and in the next *verſe* begging the pardon of them too, in Job 7. 21. theſe words, *Why doſt thou not pardon my tranſgreſſion, and take away mine iniquity?* I hope therefore *T. E.* will no more declaim ſo much againſt Confeſſion of ſins though paſt and forſaken. But that *Job* was then a ſinner, when he ſpake thoſe words, *T. E.* may be ſufficiently convinced by that confeſſion of his own mouth, which relates too to the time preſent, *Chap. 9. 20. If I ſay, I am perfect, my own mouth ſhall prove me perverſe.*

Par. This is very plain.

Min. Therefore I have not *ſtained Job's Perfection*, as *T. E.* vainly charges me; but only recite what the Holy Scriptures have recorded of Him.

Par. But againſt your inſtance of that ſaying of *Job's*, *Behold I am vile*, *Job* 40. 4. *T. E.* quotes Authors to prove the word [*vile*] there not properly to ſignifie *wicked*, but only *mean, ſmall, and of little account*, ibid.

Min. But in this place the word is uſed with reſpect to ſin, as by the circumſtances of the place it is manifeſt; it being ſaid in anſwer to the Expoſtulation of the Almighty, in whoſe dreadful preſence *Job* ſees, and confeſſes himſelf Vile and Baſe by reaſon of his ſinfulneſs: Hence, *Job* 42. 6. *I repent, and abhor my ſelf*, &c. What ſhould he repent of, if he had no ſin?

And

And for what did he abhor himſelf, but for his ſin? And doubtleſs, when *Job* had the Divine Purity before his eyes, nothing made him think himſelf ſo *vile* and *mean*, as his ſins.

Par. But, *ſays the text, in all this* Job *ſinned not*, p. 66.

Min. In that particular carriage, in *All this*, he ſinned not, that is, he curſed not God; he charged not God fooliſhly: But do's the Text ſay, that he had *never* ſinned? or that he had *no* ſin in him? But I pray you mark, that here he wholly paſſes by the account I gave you in the *Conference*, of the word [*Perfect*] not always meaning an abſolute unſinning State, but frequently no more than ſincerity, as you have it ſometimes in the Margin of the larger Bibles, *Gen.* 17. 6. *Deut.* 18. 13. This was very unfairly and diſingenuouſly done of him.

You have more reaſon to believe the Saints Confeſſions of their own State, than this Quaker's incoherent Arguments; And what can be more full than Holy *David*'s confeſſion of his being actually a ſinner, and liable to commit more? *Pſal.* 19. 12. *Who can tell how oft he offendeth? O cleanſe thou me from my ſecret faults.* See *Pſal.* 38. 18. and 51. 1, 2, 5, 9. and 130. 3, 4. *We know but in part*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 13. 9. If our knowledge be imperfect, our other Graces bear a proportion to it, and are imperfect likewiſe. What can be more plain than that ſaying of St. *Paul*? *Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect*, *Phil.* 3. 12? And therefore when he ſays, *ver.* 15. *Let us therefore, as many as be perfect*, &c. it

muſt

must needs refer to some lower degree of Perfection, and not to an absolute unsinning Perfection: Otherwise the Apostle cannot be freed from a contradiction in saying *He was perfect*, yet he was *not perfect*. For sometimes the same word (even in all Languages) has divers significations; And I could herein give many instances in the Holy Scriptures; take one for all; χάρις signifies *liberality*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 3. And yet in *ver.* 23. of the same *Chapter* it signifies *Grace*. However this cannot be denyed, as being evident in expres words, that St. *Paul* confesses himself not to be already Perfect: It is clear then, that St. *Paul* was not Perfect; And if not *He*; what Holyer Man will *T. E.* find for an example of Perfection, than St. *Paul* was; who in a vision *was rapt up into the third Heaven?* Is *T. E.* the Man think you? But this plain Confession of St. *Paul T. E.* very unfairly here lets slip, and says nothing to it; very unkindly endeavouring to shut (not his own only, but) all mens eyes to the plain and open Truth, and attempting to shift off the matter by meer evasions.

Par. But he has one shift left; that by *Resurrection of the dead*, *ver.* 11. is not meant the Last and General; which he endeavours to prove by two reasons (1.) Because the Apostle would not seem so dubious of obtaining that. (2.) He would not have told them that he had not attained That while he was alive, which could not be attained, till he was dead: this is the sum of his reasons, *p.* 71.

Min.

Min. I muſt therefore ask this bold Interpreter; What Reſurrection is then meant?

Par. He anſwers, *The Firſt Reſurrection, mention'd*, Rev. 20. 6. *which the Apoſtle refers to*, Col. 3. 1. *If ye be riſen with Chriſt, ſeek thoſe things which are above*, p. 72.

Min. The *Firſt Reſurrection* is the raiſing up a Sinner from the Death of Sin to Newneſs of life; and this is *Converſion*. Has not therefore the Quaker mended the matter well? Was St. *Paul*, ſo long after his Converſion (which we read of *Acts* 9.) dubious, whether he ſhould attain Converſion? After ſo great proficiency in Holineſs; yea after that he had (according to *T. E.*) attain'd to Abſolute Perfection; Would He tell them, he had not yet attained the Firſt Reſurrection? How effectually does *T. E's.* ſelf-contradictions baffle his new-coin'd ſenſe? But I would deſire him to conſider, that the *Reſurrection of the Dead* is often taken for the *better part*, that is for *the Reſurrection to life*, as *Luk*, 20. 35, 36. *they which ſhall be accounted worthy to obtain that World, and the Reſurrection from the dead — are equal unto the Angels*, &c. And thus it ſignifies in this 11 *ver.* He laboured, if by any means he might attain to that better part of the General Reſurrection, Namely, the endleſs life of Glory: Now is it any abſurdity for St. *Paul* to preſs after this? or to tell them, that he had not yet attained the full meaſure of his Perfection, and the end of his Hope, but was only in the Race, *&c?* *Theophylact* alſo notes, that it is not the ordinary word for *Reſurrection*, but ἐξανάστασις,

which St. *Paul* here uſeth (ſaith he) *to ſignifie his lifting up to meet the Lord in the Air, which is only the portion of Bleſſed Souls:* We conclude therefore that [*Perfect*] in *ver.* 12. muſt ſignifie the abſolute unſinning State of Perfection, which the Saints ſhall have in the next World; this St. *Paul* had not attained here in this World; Hence it neceſſarily follows, that [*Perfect*] in *ver.* 15. muſt mean ſome lower degree of Perfection.

Par. Now you have made me ſufficiently ſenſible, that it is the *Quaker*, and not the *Prieſt*, *who was as well out in his notion of the Reſurrection, as in that of Perfection.* Now he comes to examine your interpretation of 1 *Joh.* 5. 18. *whoſoever is born of God ſinneth not*, that is (ſay you) lives not in a wilful courſe and trade of ſin, though not wholly without ſin. And whereas you affirmed, that otherwiſe St. *John* would contradict other plain texts of Scripture, *viz.* 1 *King.* 8. 46. *Eccleſ.* 7. 20. *Prov.* 20. 9, *&c.* T. E. to avoid the force hereof, hath this notable device; *The words of the Apoſtle* (ſays he) *are not contradictory to theſe; The one ſpeaks of Man in a Natural State, the other of Man as begot and born of God*, p. 73.

Min. But thoſe texts ſpeak of *All* men in general, Spiritual as well as Natural, otherwiſe there would be no ſenſe in them: for inſtance, while he interprets 1 *Kin.* 8. 46. [*there is no Man that ſinneth not*;] to ſignifie only a Man in his Natural State, as he is a Child of wrath; He makes the ſenſe run thus, *There is no*

Child

Child of wrath but ſinneth; or *There is no ſinner that ſinneth not*: thus he makes the Scriptures as ridiculous as his own Canting: I hope a Spiritual Man is a Man ſtill; & therefore from the teſtimony of this Scripture, Such an one ſinneth.

As for *Prov.* 20. 9. *Who can ſay, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my ſin?* you may note, that he makes the latter part of this verſe to be only a repetition, as having no other ſenſe than that ſame, which he has given of the former part: Theſe words, [*Who can ſay — I am pure from my ſin?*] muſt ſignifie nothing, if they oppoſe *T. E*'s. aſſertion. And that threatning in *Ezek.* 18. 24. againſt a Righteous man committing iniquity (he ſays) *implies there was a time, when he did not commit iniquity*; but do's not conſider, that by *committing iniquity* there is meant his falling into groſs ſins, as appears by the words immediately added, *And doth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doth*: this implies indeed that there was a time, when the righteous Man did not commit groſs ſins, but not that there was a time when he lived without all infirmities & moral imperfections. And as for *Job* 9. 20. [*If I juſtifie my ſelf, my own mouth ſhall condemn me; If I ſay, I am perfect, it ſhall alſo prove me perverſe.*] This he would evade by an impertinent diſcourſe of *ſelf-juſtification*; while the Tranſlators meant no more than (in the ſenſe of the Original) *If I ſay I am juſt*, or (as *Olimpiodorus* expounds it) *If I dare to ſay, I am righteous*, &c. and the latter part of the verſe is expreſs enough, *If I ſay I am perfect*,

&c. If *Job* was perfect, as the Quaker pleads, what reason can be given, why he should deny it, and disclaim the Grace of God in him? why might he not say, he was so? But do you not take notice, that he has passed by the plainest place of all, *viz. Eccl.* 7. 20. [*there is not a just Man upon Earth that doth good & sinneth not?*] I hope he will not say here, that by a *Just man* is meant a *Natural man*, or a *Child of wrath*, &c.

Par. I am very much satisfied with these Scripture-proofs, yet must I not pass by his note on *Jam.* 3. 2. [*In many things we offend All.*] *This* (says *T. E.*) *do's not prove, that the Apostle himself was an offender, any more than that other saying of his concerning the Tongue, ver.* 9. [therewith bless we God, and therewith curse we men,] *can prove that the Apostle himself was a Curser*, p. 76.

Min. This is very strange! doth [*All*] in the former place signifie *Nothing*? Doth St. *James* say, *We All curse?* but he says, *We offend All*; to include himself, and exclude so false a Glos; which is thus noted in an Ancient Council, wherein St. *Augustine* was present; *In many things we offend all* —— *And why is* [*All*] *added, but that this place may agree with* Psal. 143. 2. *In Thy sight shall no Man living be justified*, &c? Which Council also shews us, that the *Pelagians* (not *T. E.*) were the first Authors of this exposition.

Concil. Milevitan. Can. 7.

Par. But I assure you, that *T. E.* is not a little proud of it; For he brings it over again, to evade the exposition of that Scripture we have been discoursing of; *If we say that we have no sin*, &c. *Its evident* (says he) *that the Apostles*,

in condescention to those to whom they writ, did many times include themselves, as in the condition of others, &c. p. 77.

Min. Ellwood follows the *Pelagian* Heretick in this also, who thus of old expounded this place: Whence the Holy Fathers of the aforesaid *Milevitan* Council, having produced this of 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. *If we say we have no sin*, &c. add---*Whosoever thinks this place is so to be taken, as if it were spoken out of Humility, and not in truth; Let him be accursed.* To which curse you see *T. E.* has entitled himself. Moreover if the Apostles do say [*We*] *sometimes* in condescension, yet it follows not that they *always* use it in that sense; In 1 *Joh.* 1. 3. says St. *John*, *That which we have seen*, &c. and *Chap.* 2. 1. *We have an Advocate*, &c. Surely He do's not mean here to exclude himself. Why therefore must [*We*] be necessarily so taken here? there is but one reason for it; it is because otherwise it would contradict *T. E*'s wild opinion, to which all Scriptures must vail and stoop. Conc. Milevit. Can. 6.

But, O ye people called Quakers, take heed of this exposition, for it will utterly overthrow your Arguments against saying [*You*] to a single Person; since the Apostles might as well change the Numbers, and say [*You*] for [*Thou*,] as change the Persons, and say [*Ye*] for [*We*:] yea I perswade my self, that if you should hear men say [*We*,] when they meant [*Ye*;] you would accuse it as a greater untruth, than to say [*You*,] when they meant [*Thou*:] And your Champion *Ellwood* loses more on one side, than he gains on the other; for while he would

prove the Apoſtles *no Offenders*, he proves them *no Quakers*; while he would ſhew they were Perfect, he makes them (according to your ſtrict way of reproving others) to be manifeſt Lyars, in ſaying [*We*,] while they mean [*Ye*.] Thus while he defends one point, he confutes himſelf in another; *Ea enim mendaciorum natura eſt, ut cohærere non poſſint.*

Lact. Inſt. l. 5. cap. 2.

By all this is manifeſt that 1 *Joh.* 5. 18. means not an *abſolute Perfection*; which further appears, and that moſt evidently in this, that this is aſſerted of *all that are Born of God*; Now *Babes in Chriſt* are born of God; But I hope, *T. E.* will not ſay, that Babes in Chriſt are abſolutely Perfect; for he that is ſo, and has overgrown all imperfections, certainly is paſt a Babe.

Par. Yet I ſee *T. E.* is ſo taken with his opinion of Perfection, that he reſolves to pull down all that ſeems to oppoſe it: And becauſe our Lord taught his Diſciples to pray, *forgive us our Treſpaſſes*; he throws away the whole Prayer ſaying, *That it doth not appear, that it was intended to be a ſtanding Rule for them to pray by as long as they lived*, p. 81.

Min. Here *Elwood* outſtrips *Pelagius*, who had the ſame Quarrel at praying for forgiveneſs; yet he durſt not ſay, that it was not uſed by the Apoſtles, or unfit for ſtrong Chriſtians, only he ſaid, *The Saints need not ſay it for themſelves, but for others who were ſinners*: Yet for this he was accurſed by the aforeſaid Council of *Milevi*. Sure I am, that our Lord taught his Diſciples this Prayer in that Sermon,

Can. 6.

which

which contains the most perfect Doctrines of Christianity, *Mat.* 5. 20. And when they had arrived to greater proficiency, he renews his injunction to them to use this Prayer, *Luk.* 11. And no doubt, the Apostles used it themselves, as well as taught it to the Church, where it was used all along, in all publick Offices; whence it was called *the Daily Prayer* by St. *Cyprian*, St. *Hilary*, and St. *Augustine*: Yea the Ancients taught the most perfect Christians to use it three times a Day. As for the Quakers pretences, that *the Spirit being come on them, this Prayer would be useless, because the Spirit would teach them what to pray for*; which he would prove out of *Joh.* 16. 13, 24. *p.* 82 I pray read those places, and you will find, that as there is not one word thereof teaching them what to pray for, so there is no ground for us to build such pretences upon. And that so much mistaken place, *Rom.* 8. 26. (objected by him) Our *not knowing what to pray for as we ought*, *Is* (says St. *Chrysostom*, and the context confirms it, which there are treating of Afflictions, and our need of patience, *ver.* 25. immediately before, and *ver.* 28. immediately after this passage) *that in our afflictions we should never wait with patience*, ver. 25. *if the Spirit did not help our infirmities to bear up under them; but we should immediately pray to be delivered* (*as St.* Paul *did*, 2 Cor. 12. 8, 9.) *though it were not best for us*; and indeed we often ask amiss, and know not what to pray for as we ought, especially when we consult the flesh. Therefore the Holy Spirit here is

Constit. Apost. l. 7. c. 25. Aug. Hom. 42.

asserted as only an Internal Intercessor (for externally to intercede for us is Christ's Office) and that not by dictating words, but by stirring up in us holy desires, and by giving us a sense of our wants, and patience with faith, submission, and devotion. In this consists the Spirit of Prayer, and is not only consistent with, but assisted by a Form of Prayer, and of fit expressions: And what is all this to the rendring the Lord's Prayer, or any publick or private Forms of Prayer useless? or to countenance *extempore* Prayers in God's publick and ordinary Worship? or mens fathering the impertinences and disorders of such effusions upon the Spirit of God? yet Oh! what strange Castles in the Ayr do's this Quaker, and other Separatists attempt to build upon this mistaken passage?

Par. But what is the reason, *T. E.* charges you with mis-stating the Case in declaiming against the *Impossibility of sinning?* p. 83.

Min. This he do's very abusively as here, so in other places, *pag.* 85, 95. but let him know, 'tis no mis-stating the Case at all; because all that I have said there is concerned in it, while all is too little to oppose the presumptions of many Quakers, and all such Perfectionists, as look upon themselves, as out of danger.

Par. I perceive, he makes it his business, to represent *your denying Perfection in his sense*, to be a discouraging men from striving against sin and Satan, which is the main thing he urges, *p.* 83, 84, 99.

Min.

Min. We ſay indeed, that our victory over theſe Enemies ſhall not be ſo compleat, as never to be diſadvantaged by them any more in this World: This whole life is a warfare; This World is a wreſtling place, and our Enemy is in the Field (as my Adverſary confeſſes;) And we tell Men, that while the Battel endures, the conqueſt is not abſolutely compleated; for if it were, what need were there of more fighting? the warfare then were ended: This whole life is a *Race*, 1 *Cor.* 9.24. And while we are running, we are not yet at the Goal. To tell men of their being abſolute Conquerors, while our Adverſaries are in Arms, is to make them *ſecure*, before they are *ſafe*: No Man can boaſt, *till he put his Armour off*, 1 *Kings* 20.11. And 'tis the Evening that Crowns the Day. Yet we teach, that if Chriſtians be watchful, and uſe God's Grace aright, they ſhall not be mortally wounded in the Battel, but gain ground of the Enemy more and more, and get the upper hand in this life: The Houſe of *Saul* in them (as I may ſo ſpeak) ſhall grow weaker and weaker, and the Houſe of *David* ſhall grow ſtronger and ſtronger; and they ſhall be abſolute Conquerors at the laſt.

We do not deny, but that Chriſtians may and muſt get a comfortable conqueſt over their Corruptions, and proceed forwards towards a total overthrow: And this is encouragement ſufficient, that (if they be faithful) they ſhall daily be on the winning and prevailing hand: as men in wreſtling with the diſtempers of their Bodies, are not diſcouraged, if they know,

they

they may daily get ground of them, and arrive at a comfortable State of health, though they know, they can never arrive at the most perfect State of health in this life. A Scholar is not discouraged in his Studies, though he knows he can never be free from all ignorance; yet because he may make a very great progress in Learning, and daily be on the improving hand, he seeketh as much learning as he can attain with a comfortable vigour and industry: A Christian may much more comfortably pursue Perfection, because he is assured he shall one day compass it, that is, in Heaven; There it is, where we shall find our selves *Saved to the uttermost*, according to *Heb.* 7. 25. which is absurdly applied by the Quaker, *p.* 96. to this present State. So that we may comfortably labour after such acquests and perfections, as are not attainable here below, because our growing endeavours here shall be rewarded with those perfections hereafter; Witness the Apostles, who pressed *forward towards the Mark, and to attain the Resurrection of the dead*, &c. And who seeketh not to grow to a State of Manhood in Divine knowledge, though that which is perfect cometh not in our present State here, where we know but in part, 1 *Cor.* 13. 9, &c? Moreover it is the most pressing encouragement, that can be exprest, to Christians, in this life to their Duty, and assault their Spiritual Enemies with all their might, and in that vigour to abound more and more, when they are told, that they shall not only receive the Prize, an Incorruptible Crown of Glory, but also

alſo an higher degree of Glory, according to the higher degrees of their increaſing vertues, and their growing valour, and holy Fortitude in this life, 1 *Cor.* 15. 41.

Par. But it is in God's Power to free men wholly from ſin here; And to ſay, that a Man cannot be perfectly cured of ſin in this life, is to *reflect upon the Ability of the Phyſician*: at this rate *T. E.* argues, *p.* 86.

Min. We do not queſtion God's *Power*, but His *Will* in this matter; becauſe we do not find any promiſe for us to expect, that He ſhould make uſe of his Omnipotence to this purpoſe. Hear what *Tertullian* anſwers to an old Heretick, who made this very objection; *Verily nothing is difficult to God; but if we ſhall ſo abruptly apply this Maxime to all our own preſumptions, we may feign what we will of the Almighty, as if he had done it, becauſe he can do it.* God is the Phyſician of our Bodies, as well as of our Souls; And yet it do's not reflect upon His Ability at all, that we are troubled with many Bodily Diſeaſes; Only it ſhews, that we are not to enjoy our perfect health and happineſs here on Earth; thus our Saviour cured no diſeaſed Bodies to an Immortal State, exempt from all bodily infirmity, in that they dyed after notwithſtanding. Terr. adv. Prax. Cap. 10.

Par. I confeſs you never pleaded, that the Enemy ſhould overcome, as *T. E.* falſly ſuggeſts, *p.* 88, 89. But he reflects upon your ſaying *I have a falſe and treacherous heart*, *p.* 90. and makes it an abſurdity to ſuppoſe by that ſaying, that a Regenerate man hath ſuch an heart, *p.* 91.

Min.

Min. Solomon ſaith *Prov.* 28. 26. *He that truſteth in his own heart, is a fool:* Now that which is not to be truſted, hath at leaſt ſome degrees of falſhood remainning in it. *Solomon* ſays elſewhere, *Keep thy heart with all diligence*; And our Lord bids us, *Watch and pray*, &c. Now ſurely that which has need of ſo much keeping, and watching, is not to be truſted without it; otherwiſe it would not need it. *From this diſeaſe we ſhall not be wholly free, till in Body and Soul we become immortal*, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*. And all orthodox Chriſtians did ever hold the Fleſh and its inclinations (though in ſome degrees mortified) to remain even in *regenerate men*: Every Man has *Fleſh* in him oppoſed to the *Spirit*, to keep him in exerciſe in this State of Trial, as is evident, not only by *Gal.* 5. 17. but by the experience of all truly humble Chriſtians; who will abhor all preſumptuous boaſtings, while they find, that though the *Spirit be willing, yet the fleſh is weak*; though the Spirit be ſincere, yet the fleſh is treacherous; becauſe (ſaith the Apoſtle) *theſe are contrary the one to the other.* And the fleſhly part in Man is in the Holy Scripture frequently called the *Heart*; ſo that *T. E.* had no reaſon to fall ſo rigidly upon this paſſage in the *Conference*.

Prov. 4. 23.
Mat. 26. 41.
In Pſal. 19.

Par. I will only mind you of one concluſion, which he draws from *Rom.* 8. 1. [*There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus*, &c.] *If there be no condemnation to them* (ſays he) *there is no ſin committed by them; for whereſoever there is ſin, there is alſo condemnation*, p. 97.

Min.

Min. A ſtrange Concluſion indeed! which if true, would damn *T. E.* and all mankind: This is *Socinianiſm* in the higheſt degree. What? No redemption? no pardon for Penitents? Has Chriſt's death done no good to the avoiding of Condemnation? then wo be to all the World. But *T. E.* has found a better way to Heaven, (*viz.*) by being ſo perfectly free from ſin, that God cannot juſtly condemn him: And hence in this whole Chapter he avoids all mention of *Chriſt's Merits*, and *Satisfaction*, and of *Remiſſion of ſins*, &c. Laying the foundation of his Title to Heaven, upon a *perfect freedom from ſin in this life*, p. 92. The Popiſh Doctrine of Merits is ſhort of this, which takes in Chriſt's Merits to their own, as giving value to them: but *T. E.* being in a greater degree *ignorant of God's Righteouſneſs, goes about to eſtabliſh his own*, *Rom.* 10. 3. But let him know (if this be his opinion) that a *poſſibility of not ſinning* will not ſerve his turn, but an actual and total freedom from it; If he commit but the leaſt ſin, he muſt be condemned according to his own Poſition. *For whereſoever there is ſin* (ſays he) *there is alſo condemnation.* God grant that he may not be dealt with according to the meaſures of his own Principles, but that he may rather ſee his error to his Converſion, than feel the ſad effect of it to his Condemnation.

The reſt of his diſcourſe on this ſubject is ſpent in artifices, to render me, and my Doctrine odious: but upon the Principles I have already laid down (in the ſtating of this Caſe of Perfection)

ſection) they will appear neither to need, nor deſerve an Anſwer.

Par. But there is one thing, which muſt not be omitted: *T. E.* thinks you, *and others, who ſet your ſelves in oppoſition to this truly Goſpel Doctrine of being perfectly deliver'd and preſerved from ſin,* to be *as the Evil Spies, who diſcouraged the heart of the Children of* Iſrael, *that they ſhould not go into the Land which the Lord had given them,* &c. p. 98, 99.

Min. The Quaker has brought this compariſon to his Diſadvantage; Did the Good Spies *Joſhuah* and *Caleb* ever tell the Children of *Iſrael* (as *T. E.* do's the Quakers) that they ſhould get ſuch a perfect victory over thoſe *Canaanites*, as that no remainders of them ſhould be left to diſturb and vex them any more? No ſuch thing; but the Scriptures tell them the contrary, juſt as we do to Chriſtians concerning their Spiritual Enemies; See *Deut.*7.22. *---thou mayſt not conſume them at once*; and in matter of fact 'tis evident they were not wholly driven out, or conſumed. 'Tis the Quakers therefore, and not Ours, that is the diſcouraging Doctrine; For if a perfect freedom from all ſins and infirmities here, be taught as the *neceſſary condition* of obtaining Heaven hereafter; then all humble Souls ſincerely thirſting after Righteouſneſs, ſtanding upon their conſtant watch, and yet finding imperfections, wants and infirmities in themſelves, will (if they believe this Doctrine) be driven into inevitable deſpair. There are ſins of Omiſſion, as well as of Commiſſion; How many aceidents may

may hinder us from performing our Devotions with that vigour, intentneſs, and exactneſs, as the purity and ſublimity of the Precepts do require? The very Conſtitutions of our * Bodies, the influence of the Clime and Seaſon, may hinder the performance of our Duties with an exact † perfection. And therefore we flee to God for Mercy in the performance of our beſt Services; See *Nehem.* 13. 14, 22. So that they do moſt effectually keep Men from coming to Heaven, who build this fools Paradiſe of imaginary unſinning Perfection for them to dwell in on Earth; wherein they grow ſo proud, and conceited, that they ſit down on this ſide *Jordan*, and fanſie they have no need of *Joſhua* to conduct them into the true Land of Promiſe; In effect they deny the Goſpel, deſpiſe the death of Chriſt, rely on their own Perfection, and (I fear) tumble into Hell, while they vainly dream of Heaven.

* Sunt & quædam non humanæ ſimpliciter naturæ, ſed huic & nunc inevitabilia, ob Corporis concretionem in animam tranſeuntem, aut adultam conſuetudinem, &c. Grot. de jure belli. l. 2. c. 20.

† Bonum non niſi ex integro, malum ex qualibet parte.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Swearing.

Par. NOW we are come to *T. E's.* Chapter of Swearing, which is so very long, that it consists of no less than 104. pages, therefore I shall only propound to you the most material passages in it.

He begins with a reflexion on that short digression, which you made upon the two Covenants, and very gravely tells us, *that you tread in an unbeaten Path*, p. 101.

Min. Had he been acquainted with Authors, and not taken things upon trust, he would not have accused the account I gave of t the two Covenants as a peculiar Notion o my own, when the same has been asserted by the greatest Clerks in Christendom: I could fill a Page with Citations of such Authors (if it were needful) as concurr in the same Notion: I shall only name two (*viz.*) Dr. *Hammond* in his Practical Catechism, and the excellent Author of the *Whole Duty of Man*, in the Preface of that same Treatise: which when *T. E.* hath consulted, he will be be satisfied, that I have trodden in no unbeaten Path: But seeing *T. E.* will have it my own Notion, and there being so much matter before us upon this Subject of Oaths, which in the Conference was primarily intended, I will pass on to that, and examine my Adversaries Objections,

jections and extravagances on this Subject.

Par. He would gladly clear *R. Habbertborn* from that impertinence and diſhoneſty, where with you charged him, in acknowledging Oaths *lawful* in the times of the Old Teſtament: yet alledging *Hoſ.* 4. 3. *Zech.* 5. 3. (Texts out of the Old Teſtament) to prove them unlawful now; *which* (he ſays) *you call his proofs, though he do not ſo himſelf*, and hints, as if they were only ſet in the Title-page of the Book, *p.* 106.

Min. However they were at firſt in the Title-page, I found them in the Book it ſelf. And if they be not Proofs, what are they then? So here is an implicit acknowledgment of a Quaker's bringing Scripture to prove *nothing.* See *Habbertborn's* Works Printed together.

Par. He thinks you miſtake the Caſe; *for they are not* (ſays he) *brought againſt that which was then lawful, but againſt that which was then unlawful, namely, the wrong uſe and abuſe of Oaths*, ibid.

Min. Wonderful ingenuity! I thought the queſtion had not been, Whether perjury, but whether any Oaths were lawful? Now to what end is a quotation brought, but to prove the Subject in hand? In a word then, I deſire the Quakers to take notice, that theſe Scriptures (*viz. Hoſ.* 4. 3. *Zech.* 5. 3.) do not reprove all Oaths as unlawful.

Par. You told me, that an Oath is an Act of Natural Religion; but he tells us, *that all acts of Religion are not acts of Natural Religion,*

as in the case of Circumcision, p. 110.

Min. 'Tis very true, that all such acts of Religion, as owe their original to a Positive Command, and have no reason in the nature of the thing to put mankind upon the observation of them, as in the case of Circumcision, these are not acts of Natural Religion; for *T. E.* may read the definition of Natural Religion in Bishop *Wilkins*'s Discourse upon that Subject, *pag.* 39. *That is Natural Religion, which Men might know, and should be obliged unto by the meer Principles of Reason improved by consideration and experience, without the help of Revelation.* Now an Oath came into use among men from the meer Principles of Reason improved by consideration, without the help of Revelation. So that if an Oath be an Act of Religion, it must be an act or part of Natural Religion. For the first that ever required an Oath was *Abimelech* a Gentile, *Gen.* 21. 23. He required *Abraham* to swear; *And* Abraham *said, I will swear, ver.* 24. Yet we read not, that either *Abimelech*'s requiring, or *Abraham*'s consenting to it, was by any positive command from God: So that *T. E.* must grant, that Men were led to bind their Covenants by a solemn calling of God to witness, and that by the light of Nature, of which more anon. But when I say, an Oath is an act or part of Natural Religion, I do not insist, that it is by Natural Religion commanded primarily, simply and *per se* towards God; but subordinately, implicitly and by consequence, as a necessary *medium* for the publick good in this State

ſtate of things: For the Law of Nature, that commands the end, muſt alſo command the only means; So that the uſe of an Oath is commanded by the Law of Nature *ex hypotheſi*, or from a ſuppoſition that it is neceſſary for the publick good; juſt in the ſame ſenſe, that Magiſtrates are commanded by the ſame Law to make Penal Laws againſt Vice: But if we were perfectly innocent, neither the one nor the other would be commanded. You may remember I told you in the Conference, that *if there were that truth in men that their bare teſtimony were infallible, and of ſufficient credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath.* Conf. p. 61. So that we are commanded by the Law of Nature to uſe Oaths only upon juſt and neceſſary occaſions. And thus I aſſert (what I did before in the Conference) that an Oath (rightly taken) that is (as every honeſt man will underſtand me, and as I interpreted my ſelf) duly circumſtantiated, and taken in *truth, in judgment and in righteouſneſs*, is an Act of Natural Religion, and underſtood plainly by the light of Nature to comprehend a great deal of Religion in it, as having God for the immediate object of that appeal, which therein is made to Him, and by which ſo many of the Divine Attributes are acknowledged and glorified, as I ſhew'd you in the *Conference*. And an Oath being ſuch, and ſo needful to the ends of juſtice and charity, it remains (as I ſaid) that it is not made unlawful by the Doctrine of Chriſt, who has prohibited nothing, that hath ſo much of Morality and goodneſs in it. Jer. 4. 2.

Par. But *T.E.* (leſt he ſhould not be underſtood) hath put in a Marginal Note in order to the explaining what Natural Religion means, *viz. The word Natural hath divers acceptations, for there is Pure Nature, Corrupt Nature, and the Divine Nature,* ibid.

Min. Theſe may be the ſenſes of the word [*Nature*,] but would any but a *Natural* have brought in theſe to expound Natural Religion? Let us apply it thereto, and then there is Pure Natural Religion, Corrupt Natural Religion, and Divine Natural Religion: Rare diſtinctions! Beſides, how comes the *Divine Nature* to be a ſenſe of the word [*Natural?*] Is *Natural* ever uſed for the Divine Nature? or are the Saints, who are partakers of it, any where called Natural men? One would ſuſpect *T. E.* was not in his right mind, when he put down this lamentable Note.

Par. T.E. tells us, you *enumerate many attributes of God, which are acknowledged by an Oath; to which* (he ſays) *no other anſwer need be given, than* that *the Divine Attributes are acknowledged by ſpeaking the truth without an Oath,* p. 112.

Min. Having mudded the Waters by his Captious exceptions, he thinks to eſcape undiſcern'd, and to put off the whole force of my reaſoning, *Conf. p.* 57, 58. with this fallacious and ſleight reply, but we muſt not part ſo.

What though a Man may believe the Attributes of God in his heart, while he ſpeaks the truth, yet do's he ſo openly, and ſo ſolemnly acknowledge them, as he that immediately calls

calls God to witneſs by an Oath? *Speaking truth* is not ſo particularly directed unto God; but an *Oath* rightly taken, or duly circumſtantiated is ſo direct an application to God, and we do ſo particularly aſcribe a Divinity to that we ſwear by, that *Lactantius* affirms, *Socrates his ſwearing by a Gooſe and a Dog* was an acknowledgment of thoſe Creatures being his Gods. And *Tertullian* plainly gives this reaſon, why the Primitive Chriſtians would not ſwear by the Genius of the Emperor, *leſt they ſhould thereby own them to be Gods.* And hence Authors generally make ſolemn Oaths to be *Acts of Religion*, and *One ſort of the worſhip of God.* So *Sanderſon* *, *Pareus* †, *Chemnitius* ‖, *&c.* But none can ſay thus of ſpeaking bare truth; and therefore the difference is very great; that being an Act of Moral vertue, but this an Act of the incommunicable Worſhip of God; that being directed to a Man, this to the true and Living God.

Lact. de fal. ſap. cap. 20.

Apolog. cap. 32.

* De juram. prælec. 1 §. 2

† In Rom. 9. 1.

‖ Loci com. de Lege Dei.

Par. But *T. E.* has a way to avoid this by telling us, that *God is more Glorified by having redeemed a People from perfidiouſneſs, treachery, and falſhood*, &c. *who can now ſpeak truth every man with his neighbour.* ibid.

Min. Though the price of our Redemption be of infinite value; yet if men improve not the Grace, which was purchaſed for them, this fault (which is in them, and not in Chriſt's Redemption) will ſpoil the Quaker's Argument. Are all Men, are all Quakers themſelves purged from hypocriſie, *&c.?* If they

be not, T. E. has said nothing to purpose against the use of solemn and Legal Oaths.

Par. He tells us now, that *from Reason you are come to Consent of Nations, your second Medium to prove swearing an Act of Religion*; and here he bids his Reader observe, *that you have wholly let go your hold of Natural Religion*, ibid.

Min. You may remember, my words were these (which I suppose he durst not cite for fear of exposing himself) *I shall resume the Method propos'd, and prove, that an Oath is an Act of Religion, out of the Light of Nature and Consent of Nations*, &c. And is not that, which can be proved an Act of Religion out of the light of Nature, and by the Consent of Nations, an Act of Natural Religion? what better way, nay, what other way to prove it? Is this letting go my hold of Natural Religion, when I prove it by an instance of Religion evident in the Light of Nature with special precept or institution? What mark will *T. E.* assign us to distinguish it from an Act of Positive Religion, according to his own distinction, *p.* 110.? So that you see here how unfairly he deals with me, which surely he would never have done, had he thought, that the Books would ever have been compared together.

Conf. p. 59. Omni autem in re consensus omnium gentium lex naturæ putanda est. Cic. Tusc. qu. lib. 1. Τὰ κοινὰ φαινόμενα πιστά. *Heraclitus* See *Grotius* de jure bel. and pa. l. 1. c. 1. p. 12.

Par. As to those instances, which you gave of *Aristotle*, *Cicero* and *Seneca*, affirming an Oath an Act of Religion out of the light of Nature; He carps only at your Quotation in *Seneca*, who says, that *Religion is the chief*

Bond

Bond of fidelity in the Militia; where he obſerves that *Seneca* do's not ſay, that an *Oath* is the chief bond, but *Religion*; and that you would perſwade your Readers, that by [*Religion* is meant an Oath, *p.* 113.

Min. Had *T. E.* read the place in *Seneca*, ſurely he would not ſo groſsly have abuſed himſelf; The whole Sentence is this, *Even as the firſt bond of fidelity in the Militia is Religion, and the love of the Enſigns, and the wickedneſs of running away, and then afterwards other things are eaſily required and commanded to thoſe who are bound by an Oath:* Nothing plainer, than that he calls that Oath, with which Souldiers are bound, *Religion*; And ſo do many other Authors. If *T.E.* have none but *Rider* by him in the Country, or his Capacity extend no higher; let him look [*Religio*] there, and he will find theſe words, *viz. Cic.* in *Flaccum, Religioni ſuæ conſulere*, i. e. *fidei & Sacramento militari.* And I think it makes much to my purpoſe, that the Romans did not call an Oath barely *Religious*, but *Religion* it ſelf, as I could prove by more inſtances, were there occaſion for it. Ser. p. 369.

Par. Well, he is reſolved to attack all your inſtances together, and accordingly charges you with ſaying, *thoſe teſtimonies do ſignifie the univerſal Conſent of Mankind in this Point. Do they ſo?* (ſays he) *What, three men (one Greek, and two Romans) to repreſent all Nations, and ſignifie the Univerſal Conſent of Mankind! &c.* ibid.

Min. He cannot be ignorant, that my words were not applied only to those three mens testimonies, but were a reply to your general question, *Why I alledged the testimonies of Heathen Authors to prove a Christian duty?* I answer'd you, that *those testimonies do signifie the universal Consent of Mankind*, &c. That is, the Testimonies of Heathen Authors in general. Wherefore I said [*Those*] not [*These*,] as he most falsly and injuriously cites my words, when he has got a little further off, *pag.* 116. As if I had meant the testimony of these three alone, when I plainly spake of all those testimonies, which might be produced from Heathen Authors, of which these three were the most eminent and plain; And since other Proofs and Examples are so numerous, I thought these might suffice, otherwise I could have cited three hundred as well as three; but indeed this is the first time a Man was ever required to bring in an induction of all Authors in the World to prove the consent of all mankind. I could fill a whole Volume with the religious manner of the Gentiles taking Oaths, being in solemn Cases accompanied with Sacrifices and devoting themselves to the justice of their Deities, if they did offend *. And so the *Samnites* and *Arcadians* custom was to take their Oaths in the midst of their Divine Worship †. At *Rome* a Magistrate could not enjoy his place longer than five days without taking an Oath, as *Livy* witnesses. Among the *Athenians* the Judges took an Oath to judge according to Law, and so did they in

Conf. p. 60.

* Liv. l. 1. and l. 21.

† Alex. ab Al. lib. 5. c. 10.

in *Ægypt*, as *Alex. ab Alex.* tells us, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 5. But if Names delight my Adversary, let him read for brevity sake that Author *lib.* 5. *cap.* 10. who shews all Nations used to swear by what they accounted their Gods and esteemed most sacred, where he reckons up the old *Grecians*, *Athenians*, *Thebeans*, yea (which will stumble *T. E.*) the *Scythians*, the *Massagetes*, *Cappadocians*, *Persians*, *Ægyptians*, *Ethiopians*, *Armenians*, *Africans*, *Indians*, &c. all agreeing to Take Oaths; only differing as much in what they swore by, as they did in their opinions of their Gods; all agreeing in this, that an Oath was a Religious Act, and only to be appropriate to the most Sacred thing, and that which they did most highly venerate. Surely *T. E.* is not a Stranger to that famous Story of *Marcus Attilius Regulus*, who took an Oath of the *Carthaginians* (whose Captive he was) that, if they would give him his liberty to return to *Rome*, he would either send them the contracted Sum for his Ransome, or deliver up himself into their hands again; and because he could not effect the former, he did the latter, which cost him his life. And do's not 1 *Kings* 18.10. sufficiently prove my Assertion? where good *Obadiah* speaks thus to *Elijah*, *As the Lord thy God liveth, there is* No Nation *or* Kingdom, *whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, He is not there, he took an* OATH *of the Kingdom and Nation, that they found thee not.*

Par.

Par. But *T.E.* tells his Reader, that *to shew the rashness of your inconsiderate assertion, he will give you some instances to the contrary. The first* (says he) *shall be of* Solon, *one of the Sages of* Greece: *A good man should have that repute, as not to need an Oath: It is a diminution of his credit to be put to swear*, p. 114.

Min. Solon's saying, as it is recorded by *Diogenes Laert.* (the best preserver of these Antiquities) has no more than καλοκαγαθίαν ὅρκου πιστοτέραν ἔχει, that is, *Account Honesty surer than an Oath*; And how do's this prove an Oath to be no Act of Religion? *Samuel* saith, *Obedience is better than Sacrifice* †; but will *T.E.* bring that to prove, Sacrifice was no Act of Religion in *Samuel*'s time? And that *Solon* did not dislike Oaths, is plain from what *Plutarch* reports in his Life, *That when he had given Laws to the* Athenians, *He caused the Senate and all the People to come into the Market-place, and bind themselves by an OATH to observe them.*

In vit. sol. p. 40.

† 1 Sam. 15.22.

Vit. Solonis.

Par. I see *T.E.* has lost one of the seven Wise men of *Greece* at the very first reincounter; but to him he *adds* Sosiades (*another of those seven Wise men*;) whose saying was, *Abstain from an Oath*, ibid

Min. Had he told us where to have found that saying, that the occasions and circumstances of it might have been consider'd, he might have expected a fuller answer than now can be given: Why may not this relate only to vain swearing? But this I must tell him, that no such

ſuch man as *Soſiades* was ever reckon'd among the ſeven Wiſe men of Greece. Had but *T. E.* conſulted his Friend *Rider*, he would have informed him, that *Solon*, *Thales*, *Periander*, *Cleobulus*, *Chilon*, *Bias* and *Pittacus* were the ſeven Wiſe men of Greece; but mentions no ſuch Man as *Soſiades*: However if he was a Wiſe man of *Greece*, he was the *Eighth*, and *Tho. Ellwood* deſerves to be reckon'd the *Ninth* for the diſcovery.

Par. His next inſtance is in *Cherillus*, whoſe ſaying was, *No Oath ought to be uſed, neither a juſt one, nor an unjuſt one*, ibid.

Min. To this I anſwer, if *Cherillus* thought all Oaths bad in themſelves, how comes he to account ſome Oaths juſt? and if the ſaying be taken in the Quaker's ſenſe, it is contradiction in its very terms: So that this Quaker's Author will come off as poorly as another *Cherillus*, who (as *Rider* tells us) "preſented "*Alexander* the Great with a Poem, that "had only ſeven good verſes in it, the reſt be-"ing ſtark naught; whereupon the Prince or-"der'd, he ſhould have ſeven Pieces of Gold "for the good Verſes, and a buffet for every "bad Verſe: If *T. E.* were ſo ſerved, that is, if he were to have a piece of Gold for every good Section of his Book, and a Buffet for every bad one, I perſwade my ſelf he would find, that he had purchaſ'd his Gold at a very dear rate.

Par. Next he Quotes the ſaying of *Epictetus*, *Refuſe an Oath, if poſſible, altogether; if not, by things obvious*, ibid.

Min.

Min. This is a Quotation little to his purpose, it being evident, that he speaks not of solemn Oaths, especially in Judicature, where it was never the custom to require Oaths by things obvious, but always by the Name of the Gods; And to confirm that *Epictetus* was not against Oaths on a serious occasion, *Arrianus* his Auditor, who writ this *Enchiridion*, and also larger Discourses from *Epictetus*'s own mouth, brings in the Philosopher solemnly swearing in his Lectures; one instance may suffice, καί τοι τὴν τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς Θεοὺς, &c. *And verily by Jove and the Gods one Creature were enough to make a modest and grateful man sensible of a Providence.*

Simplic. proœm. Comment.

Lib. 1. cap. 16.

Par. But *T. E.* says, *Plato is more positive, Away* (saith he) *with an Oath altogether*, ibid.

Min. Plato is a large Author, and if *T. E.* had told us whereabouts he said so, we might have considered the occasion and truth of this saying: Indeed he forbids the using the Names of their Gods *lightly* * or without a necessary occasion: But what makes this against solemn Swearing (upon a due occasion) by the True God? And if he say any where, *Away with an Oath altogether*, he must not be understood otherwise than of Common swearing, for these reasons. *First*, He was three times listed a Souldier in the *Athenian* Wars, among whom it was the Custom to bind their Souldiers with an Oath at their entrance into the Service. † *Secondly*, we find him frequently swearing by *Jove*, and by God, whenever he is earnestly pressing any thing. Μὰ Δία πρὸς Δίος, πρὸς Θεῶν, &

* Πάντως μὲν δὴ καλὸν ἐπιτήδευμα, θεῶν ὀνόματα μὴ χραίνειν ῥαδίως. *Plato* de legibus lib. 11. p. 917.

† Diog. Laer. vit. p. 191. collat. cum Alex. ab Al. l. 1. cap. 20. in fine.

& Νὴ Δία, being as familiar in his *Apol. pro Socrate, Critone, Phædone*, &c. as *Verily, verily* in the Gospel, of which I will engage to give 100 examples. *Thirdly*, He advises, that *a Law might be made, that no Judge should execute his Office, unless he was sworn* †. And though he thinks it inconvenient to administer Oaths in some Cases, and to some peculiar persons, that are presum'd to have great temptations to Perjure themselves; yet you may find that he allows Oaths (as to Judges, so) to several other persons, if you consult his 12*th Book of Laws*. *Let it be lawful* (says he) *for Strangers that cannot agree among themselves, to take, and administer Oaths, if they please, as it is the* Custom *of these times* *. So that if *Plato* any where forbid serious Oaths, he is strangely inconsistent with himself.

† Νόμος δὴ κεῖθω, δικαστὴν μὲν ὀμνύναι δικάζειν μέλλοντα. De legib. lib. 12. p. 948.

* ξένῳ δ' εἶναι πρὸς ξένοις, καθάπερ τανῦν, δέχεσθαί τε ὅρκους παρ' ἀλλήλων, ἂν ἐθέλωσι, καὶ διδόναι κυρίως. Id. ibid. p. 949.

Par. Menander (T.E. says) is *little less* positive, *So avoid evil swearing, as not to swear in things just and true*, ibid.

Min. The Greek is this Ὅρκον δὲ φεῦγε, κἂν δικαίως ὀμνύῃς. But neither this, nor T.E's English do at all oppose solemn Swearing in necessary Cases; for it is vain and common swearing to all truths in discourse, that brings men to such a custom, that by degrees they learn to swear any thing true or false; and therefore to escape this evil Custom, we should resolve to avoid all swearing to what we ordinarily say;

say: And this same *Menander*, to make men careful of solemn Oaths when they did take them, saith, *When thou swearest falsly, think not to conceal it from the Gods. apud Stobæum.*

Par. But *T.E.* says, *Plutarch tells them, It was unlawful for* Jupiter*'s Priests to swear.* ibid.

Min. I suppose he means, that it was their priviledge to be exempted from an Oath; For they who write upon that matter do tell us so (*viz.*) that it was the peculiar priviledge of the *Flamen Dialis* to be excepted; which plainly implies, that other sorts of Men were obliged to the taking of Oaths; Nay not so much as the *Pontifex Max.* was excepted; and if the *Flamen Dialis* was to be chosen to any peculiar office, he was to swear by Proxy*.

* Alex. ab Alex. lib. 5. cap. 10.

By the Law of *England* a Nobleman is not obliged to give evidence upon Oath: Do's this argue, that the Law looks upon an Oath as evil? Nay Noblemen themselves are not exempted in all Cases; for they cannot take upon them the execution of a Will without taking an Oath. † In an old Council held at *Berkhamstead Anno* 700. *cap.* 17. It is ordained, that the word of a King and Bishop (without an Oath) shall be irrefragable: Will *T. E.* hence argue, that an Oath was not then accounted an Act of Religion in this Nation? He himself seems to reckon the wearing of Black in mourning for the dead among the religious actions of the Heathens, *pag.* 117. and yet that also was forbid to *Jupiter*'s Priests ||. So that you may see, how glad the Quakers are to take hold of any twig to save a sinking cause; but it will not do.

† Stat. 21. H. 8. 15.

|| Aul. Gell. lib. 10. cap. 15.

Par.

Par. He tells us further, that *Fimicus said to* Lollianus, *Neither take an Oath, nor require one*, p. 115.

Min. I ſuppoſe here's ſome miſtake, and that he means ſome other perſon; for I never heard or read of ſuch a man as *Fimicus*; and therefore am not ſo well prepared to anſwer the objection. But himſelf having ſtated [*Oath*] indefinitely, may relate to an Oath in Converſe, as well as to ſuch as are tender'd upon a ſerious and ſolemn occaſion.

Par. His laſt inſtance is out of *Polybius*, who ſays, *In the better and ſimpler Ages of the World Oaths were ſeldom uſed in Judicature; but after that perfidy and lying encreaſed, the uſe of Oaths encreaſed*, ibid.

Min. If Oaths were ſeldom uſed in Judicature, do's it neceſſarily follow that they were *never* uſed in Judicature? *Polybius* writ his Hiſtory 200 years before Chriſt's time; So that we muſt look to the very beginning of the *Roman* State (whoſe Hiſtory he writes) for theſe better and ſimpler Ages; Let us go back as far as *Numa*, Succeſſor to *Romulus* (which was the beſt and ſimpleſt Age of that State:) He (ſays *Livy*) *Had endued the Breaſts of all with that Piety, that fidelity and an Oath without the fear of Laws and puniſhment did rule the whole City* †. In thoſe Ages there were fewer Men and fewer Cauſes, and therefore fewer Oaths: but neither *Polybius* nor any other can ſay truly, that in any Age they were wholly uſeleſs. And indeed this

† Eâ pietate omnium pectora imbuerat, ut Fides ac Jusjurandum, propulſo legum ac pœnarum metu, civitatem regerent. Liv. hiſt. lib. 1. Dec. 1.

Quotation

Quotation is ſo far from being to the Quaker's buſineſs, that it is directly againſt him, it proving that Oaths were then *Uſed*, though but ſeldom.

Par. Yet *T.E.* bids his Reader *judge by theſe inſtances, whether the more virtuous and honeſt ſort of Heathens did eſteem an Oath to be an Act of Natural Religion* (that is) *whether they accounted it of a Religious nature in itſelf.* ibid.

Min. Where do's any of thoſe Inſtances deny it? The ſtricteſt of them and the moſt poſitive cannot with any reaſon be interpreted to ſignifie any more than either a Dehortation from that falſhood which was the occaſion of them, or a Caution againſt evil ſwearing, that is, againſt falſe, irreverent, and needleſs Oaths. Is this to confute my Aſſertion? Let us try in a parallel Caſe: Excommunication is an Act of Religion; Now if I ſhould bring many who ſay, it muſt not be uſed Lightly, and ſome who forbid to uſe it at all inſlight manner, many who ſay, a Good man needs not to be excommunicated, and ſome, with *Polybius*, who tell us, that in the beſt and ſimpleſt Ages of the Church it was ſeldom uſed, but when Hereſies and impieties encreaſed, the uſe of Excommunication encreaſed alſo: Doth this prove Excommunication to be no Act of Chriſtian Religion? All this is true, and yet all Chriſtians continue the uſe of it, and the Quakers have ſomething like it, *pag.* 26. Let any Man judge, if *T.E.* reaſon well, or have got the victory.

That an Oath (duly circumſtantiated) is an Act of Natural Religion, & of a Religious nature in

it

it ſelf, I proved before, in that it glorifies God in the acknowledgment of His Attributes: For to make any action of a Religious nature, it's ſufficient that the Attributes of God are Glorified in the thing that is done, notwithſtanding the occaſion of the Action be but rare and accidental; and though it be no preſcribed way of the conſtant Worſhip of God, but ſecondary and occaſional in the deſignation of it; yet it is real, when thus occaſioned and performed with reverence to the Divine NAME.

Par. From inſtances of Particular Perſons, he gives one of a *Nation in general, namely the* Scythians, *whoſe Embaſſadors treating with* Alexander *the Great, thus deliver themſelves, Think not that the* Scythians *confirm their Amity by Oaths; They ſwear by keeping their Word: That it is the ſecurity of the Greeks, who Seal Deeds and call upon their Gods. We are bound by our very promiſe.* p. 115, 116.

Min. This is one of the faireſt Quotations I ſee in his Book; and to this I have much to anſwer. *Firſt*, This very ſaying declares, that it was (however) the cuſtom of the Greeks to ſeal Deeds, & to *ſwear* by calling on their Gods; yea that ſwearing is a Calling upon God, which overthrows all his Greek Authorities before produced. *Secondly*, The Embaſſadors ſay not, *they never ſwore*; only *they confirmed not their Amity* [or Leagues] *by Oaths.* In other Caſes the Scythians did ſwear *by their King's Throne, by the Wind*, or their *Sword**. And indeed they worſhipped their Sword, and ſo might well ſwear by it. *The* Scythians *hang-*

* Alex. ab Al. lib. 5. c. 10.

ing up a Sword are wont to sacrifice to it as to Mars †. *Mars is the God of this people, and instead of an Image they worship a Sword* ‖. *Thirdly*, One instance (especially of so barbarous * a Nation as the *Scythians*, who were without Towns or Houses) do's not overthrow a Law of Nature; nor do's the exception of some few *rude people* make a thing to be no Act of Religion, which the more knowing and more General Part of Mankind observe as such. I hope *T.E.* will not deny that Incest is against the Law of Nature, yet there were some whole Nations † that allowed it. *Justice is* (saith *T.E.*) *a part of Natural Religion*, p.117. yet among the *Spartans* it *was commendable to steal* ‖. And the old *Spaniards* account *Robbery* not only *Lawful*, but *Glorious* *. *To Worship the Supreme God* is confestly the Main of Natural Religion, yet the *Chineses* † and *Tartars* ‖ were sunk so much below the principles of Natural Light, that they gave no worship at all to Him, whom they accounted so. So that if it were true (as it is not) that the *Scythians* did never swear, it will not at all follow * from thence, that Swearing is no part of Natural Religion; since the Gene-

† Clem. Alex. protrept.

‖ Solinus de Scythis.

* Μὴ τοιγῶν ἀπὸ τῶν διεφθαρμένων τὰς γνώμας, τὰς κρίσεις ποιοῦ τῶν πραγμάτων· Chrysost. in Oratione, Christum Deum esse.

† Persæ, Medi, Indi, & Æthiopes cum matribus & aviis, cum filiabus & neptibus copulantur. Hieron. in Jovin. lib. 2.

‖ Plutarch in vit. Lycurgi.

* Plut. in vit. Marii.

† Semedo hist. Chin. p. 18.

‖ Jo. Plano Carpini. lib. hist. de Tartar. cap. 3.

* Παρ' ἀνθρώποις τοῖς τε ὀρθῶς καὶ ὑγιῶς ἔχουσιν, ἐστὶ δίκαιον ἀκίνητον, ὃ φυσικὸν λέγεται. εἰ δὲ τοῖς νοσοῦσι τὰς φρένας καὶ διεστραμμένοις οὐ δοκεῖ δίκαιον, οὐδὲν διαφέρει. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ λέγων τὸ μέλι γλυκὺ εἶναι ψεύδεται, διότι τοῖς νοσοῦσιν οὐ τοιοῦτον δοκεῖ· *Andron. Rhodius.*

rality

rality of Mankind has uſed it as ſuch. And now after ſo many diſcoveries of *Ellwood's* Untruths and Sophiſtries, I may juſtly retort his own queſtion here upon himſelf, *Might he not have come off with leſs ſhame, if he had uſed more modeſty?* p. 116.

Par. That Oaths were uſed among the Heathen, and by many of them *reputed Religious*, *T. E.* at length *denies not*; *but this* (ſays he) *do's not prove, that Oaths were Acts of Natural Religion*, ibid. And tells us, *It is evident, that the Heathen borrowed many Ceremonies from their Neighbours the Jews*, p. 117.

Min. You have been ſhewed that the firſt Oath that is mention'd, was tender'd by *Abimelech* (an Heathen) to *Abraham*, and accepted of and taken by him, before any poſitive Law was given about it. So that to theſe things I anſwer (*Firſt*) All real acts of Religion uſed by the Heathen, muſt be Acts of Natural Religion, becauſe they were under no Poſitive Commands. *Rom.* 2. 14. (*Secondly*) Though All, that ſome particular Perſons or people among the Heathen did account Religious actions, were not really ſo; yet *that* which is *ſo*, not only in the ſuffrage of the moſt ſober Heathen, and ſuch an univerſal Conſent of Nations, as I have proved, but alſo was uſed as an Act of Religion, by invocation of God as Witneſs, not only by *Abimelech*, but by the Holy Patriarchs, before (I ſay) any Poſitive Law was given about it, muſt needs be an Act of Natural Religion, as being dictated by nothing elſe, but the Univerſal Law of Nature. This

is so plain, that I hope, *T. E.* himself will be so ingenuous, as to consider of it.

But I have now a great complaint to make against him, That whereas (you may remember) I gave you the Definition of an Oath, and told you, it was *a religious appeal unto God, the searcher of all hearts, as a Witness of what we assert or promise, and the Avenger of Perjury*; *T. E.* wholly passes this by; it being indeed for His interest so to do; while he well consider'd, How absurd it would have been for him to have denied, either that a Religious Appeal to God is an Act of Religion, or that (being granted to be so even in the Nature and Definition of it) it is an Act of Natural Religion: So that the passing this by is plainly yielding the Cause.

Conf. p. 57.

Another thing I complain of as a grand Omission is, that all this while he has given us no definition of his own, nor any such expres's description of an Oath, as to make us understand what he means by it: This is an Omission very injurious to Peace; for as he may state the Case, we may be as much against Oaths (in his sense) as himself.

Par. I have often thought of this, yet (though I cannot excuse *T. E*'s. passing by your definition) if you mind, he has given one himself, though he do's not call it so; For he says *An Oath is but the mode or manner of speaking truth*, p. 118.

Min. A false Oath is an Oath; but a false Oath (sure) is not a mode of speaking Truth: I suppose then he means, *an Oath is a manner*

ner of asserting any thing, whether true or false.

Par. And he tells us further, that *The manner of performing this has been various; sometimes by a bare affirmation; sometimes by an additional asseveration; sometimes by calling God verbally to witness; sometimes by an Imprecation on the Party himself; sometimes by putting the Hand under the Thigh; sometimes by lifting it up to Heaven; sometimes by laying it upon the Breast; sometimes by laying it upon the Altar; sometimes by laying it upon a Book; sometimes by Kissing the Book, &c.* p. 118, 119.

Min. Did ever Man tye unequal things together at this rate? *Calling God to Witness*, this is an Oath in the true nature and formal reason of it, and has an Imprecation either expressly added to it, or implied in it: but all the rest that follow, are neither various ways or modes of speaking Truth, nor essential to an Oath; but only modes, [or Signs rather] of Calling God to witness; and variable arbitrary Ceremonies of expressing an Oath. But the Oath it self, you must understand, is (in reference to Truth) the *Confirmation* of it, *Heb. 6. 16.* not a mode, nor ceremony of speaking it. As a vow is a Confirmation of virginity, and neither a Ceremony nor a mode thereof. But among all these which he has given us as modes or ways of expressing Truth, he has not shewed us, which of all these is an Oath.

Par. He tells us, an *Oath is made up out of them*, p. 119.

Min. He cannot mean, that it is made up of them all *conjunctì*: For the first of these, *viz.* a *bare single Affirmation*, being single excludes all the rest; The second, *viz.* an *Additional Asseveraton*, stops there and goes no further; And those various Ceremonies of *putting the Hand under the Thigh*, *lifting it up to Heaven*, and the rest, cannot be supposed to have ever been used together in the same Oath; therefore an Oath cannot be made up of all these conjunct: If so, then it can be but made up of *some* of them; but *T. E.* has not told us which of them he meant; neither what mode of speaking Truth an Oath is, nor of what modes it is made up.

Par. But *T. E.* has one scruple which troubles him often, to which I pray, answer once for all. *Consider* (says he) *now, I pray, What act of Natural Religion is that, which, the more truly Christian men become, the less need they have of it.* And here he thinks he has Bishop *Gauden* of his side, Who lays the *necessity* of Oaths *upon mens evil manners.* Yea, he says, *You confess* † *as much your self: Which* (as he thinks) *plainly shews, that an Oath is not an Act of Natural Religion*, p. 120, 121.

Ex malis moribus bonæ naſcuntur leges.

† Conf. p. 61.

Min. That evil manners make Oaths more necessary, I did and still do confess; but all *T. E's.* inferences from thence rely on this false and rotten foundation; *That no acts of Natural Religion can be founded upon mens evil manners.* Repentance is an act of Natural Religion; yet the more truly Christian men become, and the more free from sin, the less need they have of it:

But

But here in this passage of *T. E's.* we must distinguish between him that *needs* an Oath, and him that *takes* it; for the Holiest man may need a bad mans Oath to assure his testimony, *&c. Ellwood* confesses that *Justice is an Act of Natural Religion* (p. 118;) and one part of it is called *Distributive*, which in all its Penal Acts depends wholly upon the ill manners of Men, as much as Oaths. The like may be said of Mercy, as to that part of it which forgives injuries, *&c.* And yet the more truly Christian men become, the less need there would be of either of these. Yea St. *Paul* says concerning the Law, that it *is not made for a righteous man*, 1 Tim. 1. 9. Ὁτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται, says *Demonax* in *Lucian*: And *Constantius* the Emperor, *If it were possible all men could be Philosophers, there would be no need of Compulsion by Laws; for that which now they forbear out of Fear, they would then hate out of Judgment* †. And much more I might cite to this purpose; but shall I therefore argue from hence, that Justice and Mercy, *&c.* are no moral virtues? Or that Oaths, like many other good Moral Acts, and Acts of Natural Religion, some in their own Nature, some in their immediate ends, are nothing else but Remedies against evil; Especially seeing *T. E.* himself (*p.* 118.) calls both these, *viz. doing Justice*, and *shewing Mercy Moral and eternal Precepts*? Why then should he here exclude a duly circumstantiated Oath, which in its primary designation is an Act of Justice, as I told you in the *Conference*?

† Orat. pro Themist.

Par. But your ſecond Propoſition, *That an Oath is an Act of neceſſary juſtice and charity towards men, and that in order to the ending of ſtrife by Evidence*, T.E. anſwers, that *Evidence is neceſſary, but not an Oath; for Evidence may be given by a plain affirmation*, &c. And that *an Oath is therefore ſuperfluous*, p. 122.

Min. I anſwer, that a bare Affirmation indeed is an Evidence, but not ſo well aſſured: And he wilfully paſſes by the Anſwer I gave you to this in the *Conference*, which methinks might ſatisfie a Reaſonable man, *viz.* That *Conſcience do's not dread all ſins alike*, &c. and that *multitudes who fear not a Lye, yet do dread the ſolemnity of an Oath, and the horrour of Perjury* †. In oppoſing this he oppoſeth himſelf, for he ſeems to grant it *pag.* 119. However he oppoſeth common ſenſe; for all men are more apt to believe thoſe that are upon their Oaths, than if they were not.

† Conf. p. 62.

Par. But he ſays, that *you muſt either deny, that there is in any man that truth, which may make his bare teſtimony of ſufficient credit; or yield, that there are ſome men, from whom there is no need at all of an Oath*, p. 124.

Min. His conſequence is not good; I grant there are ſome men, whoſe reputation may give great credit to their bare teſtimony: But in a caſe, where my life, credit, or eſtate is at ſtake, ſuch an one (ſeeing he is not infallible) muſt not take it ill, that I require the utmoſt aſſurance that may be had, *viz.* his Oath; for I ſee his *face* ‖, but not his *heart*. By what certain mark ſhall we knowmens Integrity? And though ſome

‖ Frontis nulla fides.

ſome men may be ſatisfied concerning this or that mans veracity; yet others, who may be concern'd in his Teſtimony, may not be ſo: And if ſome men be believed in publick Evidence without an Oath; others, who are privy to their own Integrity, may cenſure this as partiality, if their Evidences be not ſo taken alſo; However ill diſpoſed men will readily make it occaſion of cenſure and Contention. And though I ſay not, *All Oaths are infallible*; yet this I ſay, that they are the *higheſt* and *beſt* ſecurity we can have in this World; and higher aſſurances we muſt not expect.

Par. He abuſes you alſo for ſaying in the Prophet *David*'s words *Pſal.* 116. *All men are Lyars. p.* 124. And tells us, that *David indeed in his great Affliction let ſuch an expreſſion drop; but be quickly recalled himſelf, and confeſt it was ſpoken in haſte:* [*Haſte*] I perceive he takes for raſhneſs, and therefore ſays, *You catcht up the word at a venture*, ibid.

Min. He has done ſo, I am ſure; and has accuſed me here as raſhly as he fancies *David* accuſed all Mankind. *David* ſaid it in his *haſte*, that is, when *Saul* was in purſuit of him, *in fugâ* in his flight, ſaith *Gejerus*, and Dr. *Hammond* on the place: When he was in haſte, that is, hotly purſued by his Enemies, he *then* found there was no Truth in man; and therefore muſt rely on God, and not on the Arm of fleſh. But ſuppoſe *David* had been guilty of this imperfection, and had ſpoken *in haſte* according to *Ellwood*'s ſenſe; Was St. *Paul* in haſte too, when he ſaid, *Let God be true, but every man a Lyar, Rom.* 3. 4? The

Ego dixi inter fugiendum. Chald. Paraphr.

The meaning whereof is, *Every man is fallible*; Yea the beſt man may depart from his Integrity, as *T. E.* himſelf confeſſes. *p.* 68.

Par. But *T.E.* ſays, If *Felons cannot be held without Fetters, muſt True men therefore wear Shackles? p.* 125.

Min. Till honeſt men (*occaſionally ſuſpected*) be known to be *ſuch*, they are laid in the ſame Irons with Felons; and ſince Honeſt men live among Knaves in this World, and ſometimes Knaves do appear in the dreſs of Honeſt men, there it is prudent to uſe the ſame Bonds, Seals, Witneſſes, Oaths, *&c.* to oblige the one, as we uſe to bind the other. But if *T. E.* can inform us of any certain viſible Mark, whereby we may be ſure *ſuch a Man is* Honeſt, and will not deceive us, by my Conſent we will take his bare word; but the World never knew ſuch a Mark as yet. All men are not *actually lyars*, but all Men may lye ſometimes; and we cannot tell when they will do ſo, and when not: So that we will lay the ſtrongeſt obligations upon them we can, in weighty Caſes; and then we have done our part. I know that the ſtrongeſt Bond and beſt Security may fail, but he that takes the beſt and moſt likely, acts with moſt prudence and ſafety. To conclude, it were happy, if there were no *ſickneſs*; but ſo long as we either are ſick, or are in a poſſibility of being ſick, *Remedies* are and will be good: and ſo Oaths are and will be Good and needful, ſo long as any Men *can*, or any men *do* deceive; and ſo long, till we know by evident Tokens thoſe that cannot deceive us from thoſe that can; which Art

as

as yet we are ſo far from having learned, that we are generally Cheated by thoſe we put moſt confidence in.

Par. If Hypocriſie and Wickedneß (ſaith T.E.) *be reaſons of demanding an Oath, does not he, that in conformity thereunto takes an Oath, acknowledge himſelf to be Hypocritical and Wicked?* p. 126.

Min. I anſwer, that ſuppoſing theſe were the reaſons, it only follows, that thoſe that demand an Oath look upon him as fallacious (for ought they know:) but the Juror does no more acknowledge himſelf to be an Hypocrite, than he, that Seals a Bond for the performance of ſuch and ſuch Covenants and Conditions, do's by that acknowledge himſelf a Knave. When an Honeſt man therefore Seals, or Swears, *&c.* it is (*Firſt*) Becauſe it is legally demanded of him; and (*Secondly*) Becauſe it is both neceſſary and juſt in order to the ſatisfaction of the Parties demanding it. He hereby only acknowledges he lives in an Evil world, and ſo muſt be dealt with, as one that may be an Evil man; but he does not acknowledge that he really is one.

Par. But Evil men (ſays he) *will not make any more Conſcience of falſe Swearing, than of falſe ſpeaking.* p.127. And for this he cites Biſhop *Gauden*, ibid.

Min. As for Biſhop *Gauden*, he ſpeaks of thoſe who have got a *cuſtom* of Swearing, which is another caſe. But for the Quakers objection, that *Men leavened with hypocriſie & ſwayed* with *malice and Intereſt* are not to be truſted, when they

they do Swear: I answer, that Experience shews, that Evil men will say much more, than they dare swear to in a Court of Judicature; Many dread Swearing, that do not stick at Lying. But if we grant that some are so wicked, that they will both lye and forswear; what then? *'tis to no purpose to require an Oath of them*, says the Quaker: I answer, yes; for why should a mans wickedness priviledge him from the duties of Society? this is the way to encourage more to be wicked: We know a Knave's Bond is little better than his his Word, and yet we take his Bond as the best assurance we can have. If we had a Mad-man, who would be likely to break all the Cords we have to tye him with, shall we let him run loose? *Nonne debui facere quod possum, si non potui totum quod volui* †? We will bind an Evil man with an Oath (that *Bond of the Soul*, *Num.* 30. 2.) hoping that partly for fear of Hell and the Curse due to Perjury from God, and partly from dread of the outward Penalty from Men (as *T. E.* notes) he will not forswear himself: If he do, let him look to it; we have done our best to be safe; And it is not in this Case alone, but in all others, *There's no fence against them, who fear neither God nor Man.*

† Aug. Hieron. Epis. 28.

Par. But *T. E.* thinks his Argument safe under the Testimonies of the Ancients; and first brings in *Chrysostom* saying, *He that doth not stick at Lying, will not fear Swearing*, p. 128.

Min. If St. *Chrysostom*'s words must be taken in *T. E*'s. sense, they make Oaths as insignificant

ficant during the Law, as in the times of the Goſpel; that reaſon being as good then, as now. And though I might urge, that the Learned have doubted, Whether the Homilies he Quotes were St. *Chryſoſtom*'s or no; yet I ſhall take it as granted, and reply further.

Firſt, That it is true of Common diſcourſe, where raſh Oaths ſpoken without any ſolemnity, do as eaſily fall from Common Swearers, as Lyes from Common Lyars; But in Judicial Oaths Experience ſhews, that Men have a greater dread upon them: And that this whole Diſcourſe is to be underſtood only of Common Swearing, *viz.* to ſhew that a Man is not one whit more to be Credited in his Diſcourſe for the Oaths he mingles with it, I thus prove. *(Firſt)* Theſe are Homilies, which were Popular Sermons; and were not directed to the Magiſtrates, who had the power of giving and requiring Oaths. *(Secondly)* In all the genuine Homiles of St. *Chryſoſtom* about Swearing, He plainly ſpeaks only of private mens Swearing among themſelves, which he calls περιττὸς ὅρκους *ſuperfluous Oaths*. *Hom.* 5. *ad pop. Antioch*: And there tells the people, he would not give over Preaching againſt it, *till they had left this evil Cuſtom of Common Swearing*; And adviſes the Maſters and Miſtreſſes of ſuch Servants as ſwore in their Families, *to make them go Supperleſs to Bed.* *(Thirdly)* In all probability St. *Chryſoſtom* would not dare (being a Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*) in the Imperial City to inveigh againſt the Oaths then uſed in the

the Emperors Judicatories; or if he had, his many and bitter Enemies (who laid other frivolous things to his Charge) would surely have deeply accused him for this, which yet is never mentioned: So that this can be meant of none but private Oaths in Communication.

Secondly. If *T.E.* apply it to publick Oaths, he shall see the weakness of such arguing by a familiar instance: Suppose *T.E.* be to lend 100 *l.* of some Orphans under his Care, Will he not expect and require a Bond? I believe, He will; and I ask Why? *The Man is either one that fears God and is Honest, and then his Word is good without a Bond; or he does not fear God and is a Knave, and then his Bond is of little value:* Would *T.E.* or any wise Man with such plausible Arguments be wheedled out of a prudent care of the best security he could get? I speak not this to derogate from the Fathers; but in their Popular Discourses (tis sufficiently known) their Arguments are rather Rhetorical than Logical, and must not always be used as Authority in Dispute; but as to this Quotation, it is applied by *T. E.* to a purpose contrary to the Author's meaning, and that makes it degenerate into a meer fallacy. But of St. *Chrysostom* more hereafter.

Par. Next *T.E.* brings in *Isidorus Pelusiota* writing thus, *Obey His voice, that forbiddeth to Swear at all.* p.129. He brings in also *Erasmus*, the *Scythians*, *Antipho* and *Sophocles* also out of *Stobæus*, p.130.

Min.

Min. Iſidore of *Peluſium* imitates his Maſter *St. Chryſoſtom*, and is alſo to be interpreted of private Oaths, which inredulous Men require of one another in ordinary Communication, and take familiarly, which no doubt are great ſins: And that he means it not of Magiſtrates requiring publick Oaths is plain, becauſe that was always Lawful before Chriſts time; and (whatever *T. E's.* opinion be) *Iſidore* affirmeth, *That the Son of God did not add any new Doctrine over and above what was in the Law and the Prophets* ‖. But to teach publick Oaths to be unlawful, had been a new Doctrine, never heard of before: Chriſt therefore and *Iſidore* only do forbid private and needleſs and common Swearing, which were forbidden in the Law and the Prophets, had they not been ill interpreted by the Phariſees.

‖ Lib. 1. Ep. 107. ad Tim. Lector.

To his leſſer Authorities I reply, That not one of thoſe he cites were againſt ſolemn Swearing, and therefore they (ſaying much the ſame, that the two preceding Fathers had done) do confirm us in the belief, the Fathers ſpoke of ordinary Swearing; for theſe do ſo.

Firſt, *Eraſmus* his opinion may be known from the very place cited by *Ellwood*, *viz.* his *Comment* on *Jam.* 5. 12. Where after he has inveighed againſt thoſe that Swear *by God in light or trivial matters*, and thoſe that Swear after the Jewiſh Cuſtom *by Heaven*, *by the Earth*, &c. He immediately adds the words quoted by this Quaker, *Whoſoever dare be bold to lye without Swearing, he dares do the ſame, when he Sweareth, if he liſt.* What kind of Swearing

Swearing is here meant, the very words immediately before this Sentence sufficiently evidence. But if it be not plain enough, let *T.E.* consult *Erasmus*'s Annotations on *Mat.* 5. 37. where are words to this effect, *I suppose that Christ did only mean, that the Perfect* [or grown Christians] *(for of these he speaks) ought not at all to Swear upon the account of Those things, which make the Common people great Swearers: Otherwise* (saith he) *in a Cause of* * *Faith, or Piety, even Christ himself and the Apostles* SWEAR. And again, *Many hard questions might be easily solved, if we understand that Christ did not simply* [or absolutely] *forbid these, but only forbad them to be used in that common manner, people were wont then to use them in* †. If *T.E.* read on, he may see *Erasmus*'s opinion in more things than this, wherein he will find Him, as much as any, opposite to the Quakers Tenents.

* Opinor Christum simpliciter sensisse, perfectis (nam de his loquitur) Omnino non esse jurandum pro rebus hisce pro quibus vulgus dejerat. Alioqui in causa fidei aut Pietatis etiam Christus & Apostoli jurant. Eras. Annot. in Mat. 5. 37.

† Hac autem ratione multarum quæstionum nodi dissolvi poterunt, si intelligamus Christum non simpliciter hæc vetuisse, sed vetuisse eo more fieri, quo vulgato more hominum fiebant. Sic vetuit irasci, sic vetuit salutare quenquam in viâ, sic vetuit ditescere, sic vetuit resistere malo, sic vetuit appellari Magistros, sic vetuit vocare Patrem in terris. *id. ibid.*

Secondly, That the *Scythians* did Swear also in some Cases, I have proved before.

Thirdly, *Antipho* (in the same place of *Stobæus*) inveighs against those who will not believe a serious Oath, saying, *When any despises a Man Swearing, that never was convict of Falseswearing*

Swearing, he ſeems to me to deſpiſe the Gods, and to have formerly been guilty of Perjury himſelf.

Fourthly, *Sophocles* (in *Stobæus* alſo) ſaith, *The Mind is made more cautious by the appoſition of an Oath; for then a Man muſt take heed of two things, leſt he injure his Neighbour, and offend againſt the Gods.* If the Quaker read the other Sentences in *Stobæus*, he muſt needs ſee theſe, which plainly ſhew that they were not againſt Serious Oaths: And therefore though they ſay, *The Oaths of wicked men are of little value*; yet they never meant to exempt wicked men from publick Swearing on great occaſions. Yet I will tell *T. E.* one thing, now I think of it, The Civil and Canon Law, I am ſure (and I think our Common Law) which all allow publick Swearing, knowing that the Oath of an ill Man is of little weight, do give the Parties liberty to *except* againſt a *notorious wicked Man*, ſo that he ſhall not be allowed to Swear or give Evidence †. And thus *T. E.*'s Argument every way falls to the ground.

† L. quoniam c. de teſtib. Vid. Heersbick Chriſtian. Juriſpr. in g. Præcept. p. 261. & Decret. Gregor. l. 2. Tit. 25. cap. 1.

Par. Now he comes to tell us, that *the aboliſhing of an Oath would not derogate*; *Nay*, he adds, *the continuing of Oaths doth derogate from the Honour of Chriſtianity*, &c *For it* (ſays he) *mounts far above all other Religions, and leads them that ſincerely embrace it, to a Perfection beyond what ever was attainable in any of them, yet in them Oaths were attainable*, &c.

And he brings in Biſhop *Gauden* ſaying, *The Primitive Chriſtians did ſo keep up the ſanctity and credit of their Profeſſion among Unbelievers, that it was ſecurity enough in all Caſes to ſay,* Chriſtianus ſum, *I am a Chriſtian. If any urged them further to any Oath, for matter, or manner, or authority unlawful, they repeated this, as the only ſatisfaction they could give,* &c. p. 131, 132.

Min. To theſe I anſwer, Firſt, That *T. E.* minces my Argument, which was this, *Seeing therefore that the ends of Juſtice and Charity are ſo much ſerved by the Religious uſe of an Oath; would not the aboliſhing of it derogate from the honour of Chriſtianity? for while the Apoſtle ſaith,* An Oath for confirmation is the end of all ſtrife; *if you take away an Oath, you take away that which was ordained by God to be the moſt effectual means of ending it, and ſo make Chriſt not ſo much the Prince of Peace, as Diſcord, by making him the aboliſher of that which was deſign'd to compoſe it* *. Now had the Quaker found my Argument really faulty, why did he not ſtrike at the foundation of it? which is this, *An Oath for confirmation is an end of ſtrife*: by which omiſſion he has render'd his other reaſonings impertinent and vain. I grant it would be for the honour of Chriſtianity, to take away the need of an Oath; but to make a Law againſt it, while the neceſſity continues, this is not for its honour.

* Conf. p. 62, 63.

2. Though Oaths were *attainable* under Judaiſm and Heatheniſm, it does not follow,

low, that they are *Useless* now. *Justice* in punishing, and *Government* by Laws and Magistrates were attainable too, the Jews and Heathens being thus kept in order; but must *We* therefore throw these away?

3. Would All *sincerely embrace* Christianity, I know with *T. E.* that it would make them *upright, just and true, so that they durst not speak a falshood*, and so there would be no need of an Oath. But if *T.E.* let Oaths alone till this come to pass, I promise him, I will not then dispute for them. If men were what they *are* not, than might we spare, what now we *cannot* be without.

4. As to Bishop *Gauden's* words, I see no Argument producible thence against *us*; For the Bishop does not say, that the Primitive Christians refused to take *Any* Oath whatever [*indefinitely*] (for then he need have gone no further;) but only such an Oath, as *for matter, or manner, or Authority was unlawful.* And which of Us does plead for such an Oath? But to give you further satisfaction in this point, I shall hereafter prove, what the Bishop speaks of the Primitive Christians, *viz.* that they did not refuse any Oaths, but such as were unlawful upon some of these accounts; but did swear *by Gods Name*, as we do, in necessary Cases.

Par. But still *T.E.* replies, *How great a derogation is this from the Honour of Christianity?* p. 133.

Min. So he may argue, are Rods and Axes, Prisons and Fines, Houses of Correction, and

places of Execution; tis very ſad that Chriſtianity hath not ſet its followers above the need of theſe things; but he will ſcarce perſwade our Governours to throw away theſe Inſtruments of Government, which help to keep the ſeditious in ſome awe. A man may lament it, that theſe things ſhould be neceſſary; but ſince they are ſo, they muſt be retained. I remember *Seneca* cries out in a Rhetorical ſtrain, *O how baſe a Confeſſion is this from Mankind, of their publick fraud and villany, that our Seals ſhall be of more credit than our Souls* *! yet *Seneca* never intended that Bonds, and Sealing of Deeds ſhould be taken out of the World, conſidering what men were.

*Oturpem humani generis fraudis ac requiriæ publicæ confeſſionem, Annulis noſtris plus quàm animis creditur.' Sen. de benef. l. 3. c. 15.

And truly if Oaths were taken away, and other like Securities at *T. E's.* Motion, we ſhould ſoon find ſuch a flood of Cheating and Lying break in upon us, as would derogate ten times more from the Honour of Chriſtianity, than ſolemn ſwearing doth; which indeed does not diſhonour it at all, though the occaſion of its being uſed in Publick Courts is ſome diſgrace. But though the occaſion be Evil, yet Swearing is Good; and would be of uſe in Dedicating our ſelves to God, *Pſal.* 119. 106. and in Conſecrating our voluntary Oblations, *Numb.* 30. 2. and in other Caſes, though the uſe of them in Judicature ſhould ceaſe;

ceaſe; for *we can offer nothing more acceptable to God than a juſt Oath* *, ſaith St. *Auguſtine*; And when Chriſtians take Oaths with all due Reverence, & are careful not to ſatisfie or break them for the whole World, I think they honour their Profeſſion, and do not diſgrace it, whether in Judgment or on other grand occaſions.

* Nihil Deo gratius offerre poſſumus quam jure jurando. Aug. in Pſ. 19.

Par. But *T.E.* wonders, that from the Apoſtle's words, *Heb.6. 16.* [*An Oath for Confirmation is to them an end of all ſtrife*] you ſhould conclude, that an Oath [*is*] *ordained by God to be the moſt effectual means of compoſing it, whereas you ſhould rather have ſaid* [*was*] *ordained, if you had intended to deal fairly.* p. 134.

Min. Is he angry then that I quote Scripture aright? Had the Apoſtle ſaid that *an Oath for confirmation* [*Was*] *an end of ſtrife*, than had I indeed dealt unfairly. But if the Holy Ghoſt ſpeak in the Preſent tenſe (as may reaſonably be concluded He does, becauſe [ὀμνύουσι *Swear*] in the ſame verſe is of this tenſe) let not the Quaker blame me for ſpeaking here ſo too.

Par. But he has another rare Criticiſm, *St.* Paul *do's not ſay* [WE] *ſwear, but* [MEN] *ſwear, nor* [*to* Us] *an End* —— *but* [*to Them*] an End, ſo that he ſpeaks of Men *under the Law*, and Men in a *carnal ſtate*, p. 135.

Min. If *T.E.* had looked back to *ver.* 13. and read the *Antecedent* which lies there, he would have ſeen the impertinence of his long Criticiſm; the words are theſe, [*For when God made the promiſe to Abraham, becauſe* HE

could ſwear by no Greater, He ſware by Himſelf:] and then *ver.* 14. 15. the Apoſtle repeating the Promiſe and the certainty of it adds, *v.* 16. [*For* MEN *verily ſwear by the greater, and an Oath for Confirmation is to* THEM *an end*, &c.] Here the Antitheſis lies; not between *Saints* and *Carnal Men*, nor between *Chriſtians* and *Jews*, *Them* and *Us*; But between *God* and *Men*, between *Him* and *Them*; the ſenſe being, God did act in this Oath *more humano*, He confirmed it by an Oath, as Men uſe to do, only with this difference, that God could not ſwear by any Greater than himſelf, whereas Men always do ſwear by a Greater: yet the event is the ſame; for God's Oath by Himſelf put the promiſe out of all queſtion, even as Mens ſwearing by a Greater, to confirm what they ſay, is to Them an end of all ſtrife.

Par. But *T.E.* infers from 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. that the Apoſtle in this place does not by [*Men*] intend *Saints, true Believers, the New Teſtament Church; but ſuch as were under the old diſpenſation. Nor are you or any elſe to take advantage from the Apoſtle's ſpeaking in the Preſent tenſe (Men* [do] *ſwear*, &c. and an Oath [is] to them, &c.) *from thence inferring that he ſpake this of the Chriſtian State:* Becauſe *on other occaſions he expreſſes himſelf in the ſame tenſe, as in* Heb. 8. 3. and 9. 3. *p.* 136, 137.

Min. To the firſt I anſwer, it does not follow from 1 *Cor.* 3. 3 *. that [*Men*] here in *Heb.* 6. 16. ſhould exclude thoſe of the Chriſtian

* Κατ' ἄνθρωπον.

ſtian Church, unleſs *T. E.* could prove, that [*Men*] in other places of Scripture did always ſignifie *Carnal* and *bad Men* only. What do's he think of that ſaying of our Lords, *Luke* 12. 35, 36. *Let your loins be girded about, and you Lights burning; And ye your ſelves like unto* MEN * *that wait for their Lord, &c.?* What means 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. *Quit you like men?* I am ſure our Tranſlators do take [MEN] in a quite contrary ſenſe to *T. E.* ſometimes; For in 1 *Cor.* 14. 20. the Greek is τέλειοι [*be ye perfect,*] yet they read [*be ye* MEN,] taking [MEN] for *Perfect men.* * ἀνδρώποις.

To the ſecond I anſwer, That his ſhifts to evade the force of the particle [*is*] in the preſent Tenſe (which he pretends St. *Paul* uſes in this Epiſtle for things that had been *among the Jews*, but are *not applicable to the Chriſtian State*) are very wretched. The Apoſtle ſaid truly, *there is a High Prieſt*, and *is a Holieſt of all*; for at that time there were both in being, and he could not ſpeak truly in any other Tenſe: but do's it follow from thence, that always, when he uſeth [*Is,*] it is of things only applicable to the Jewiſh State? In this *Chap. ver.* 20. He ſaith, *Chriſt* [*is*] *enter'd into the Heavens*; and *Chap.* 4. 12. *For the word of God* [*is*] *quick*, &c. and *Chap.* 11. 1. *Faith* [*is*] *the ſubſtance*, &c. What non-ſenſe and Blaſphemy would it make to ſay here, [*Is*] only was applicable to the Jewiſh State, when theſe things were true then, and will be ſo to the end of the World, to Jews and Chriſtians all alike? And when this was the plain and

common ſenſe, what reaſon has *T.E.* to make [*Is*] ſtand for [*was*,] but only that he may impoſe his own abſurd Notions on the Holy Scripture? As he does again, *p.* 139. Where he impudently puts his falſe opinion into the middle of a Text of Scripture meerly to force it to his own ſenſe, *The Law (in which Oaths were,* ſays he) *was given by* Moſes, *but the Grace and the Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt*, Joh. 1.17. Whereas the Goſpel and the Law do not oppoſe each other in this matter, as I ſhall prove immediately: But 'tis plain he makes no ſcruple of abuſing Scripture, for in the ſame place, reading ſome exhortations in the Goſpel to *Truth*, *Sincerity*, *Love*, &c. from theſe precepts he infers, that Men (he means Quakers, I ſuppoſe) now are really endued with all theſe vertues; though 'tis a plain fallacy to argue from what we *ought* to be, to what we *are*; yet this is a common way the Quakers have of profaning Holy Scripture, to take Chriſt's Precepts and turn them into Affirmations, applying them as *Encomiums* to their own miſ-led Party; being herein like the *Jews*, who delighted much in hanging the Precepts of the Law in Phylacteries about them for ornament and oſtentation, but took no care to live up to them in their Converſations: See the Quaker in this poſture, *p.* 147, 148.

* Treat. Conf. p. 50.

Par. Now (ſays T. E.) *you are come to your Third Propoſition*, viz. *That an Oath is a part of that Moral and Eternal Law, which our Saviour profeſſeth, he came not to deſtroy, but to fulfil* *. p. 149. *Min.*

Min. This is a cunning and malicious untruth, for though he be come to it, I am not yet come so far; for the last words objected by the Quaker were out of *p* 63. But the Figure [3] in the Margin of my Book noting the third *Proposition* is placed, *p.* 68. Yet to colour over the Matter, he begins with the last words of these four pages, and first sets upon the *Conclusion*, p. 68. and then runs back presently to the *beginning*, p. 63. But I perceive his Treachery, *viz.* he would make his Reader believe, that *All* I say to prove *Oaths not evil in themselves*, is said to prove them *part of the Moral and Eternal Law*; But I desire you and others to observe, that I am yet upon the proof of my second *Proposition*, That *Oaths are a piece of Necessary Justice and Charity*; only foreseeing that some would object, that *Oaths are evil in themselves*, and so could not be *Necessary*: I first prove *they are not evil in themselves*. Secondly, in *page* † *66.* I go on to † Conf. answer a second objection, *viz.* That *Oaths are part of the Ceremonial Law, and so could be no parts of Justice and Charity*: Which having disproved as a Transition to my third Proposition, *p.* 68. I make that Inference (the way being now Clear, and Oaths proved necessary Parts of Justice and Charity, as also neither Evil in themselves, nor Ceremonial) *Therefore they are parts of the Moral Law*, the next thing to be proved: This is the very truth; and now where is *T. E.*'s *sincerity*? where is his *honesty*, so apparently to prevaricate?

Far.

Par. But here he makes himself much sport, that you should *bestirr your self not a little to prove that, which* (he says) *he never yet heard any deny, Namely, that all Oaths are not Evil in themselves, which you gravely inferr from their having been once confessedly Lawful. What else is this, but to mis-spend your Time, and bestow many a doughty blow upon your own shadow?* p. 141.

Min. T.E. could not be better pleas'd with my expressions, than I am with this answer. So that I shall reply upon him with his own words, † pag. 56. *Did he consider what he writ?* If He thinks that *All Oaths are not Evil in themselves*; let him give an account, why he produced the testimony of Heathens against them, nay the Testimony of a whole Nation, as he pretends. He will not say, that *the Heathens had any Revelation to forbid all Oaths:* So that they could not be evil in *their* sense, but as they were evil in themselves. Why do's *T. E.* commend their zeal for refusing all Oaths, seeing they could not be evil to *Them?* Did not *he mis-spend his Time* in producing these testimonies? Has not *he* lost here his Argument to save his Jest? and made one part of his Book inconsistent with another?

But further to prove Oaths *Moral*, I shall desire to know of the Quakers, whether they account the third Commandment Moral.

Par. I think none of them will be so absurd as to deny it.

Min. Than an Oath is *Moral*; for [*Thou shalt not take the Name of the* Lord *thy God in vain*]

vain] is(according to both the Ancient and Modern Divines) *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf.* The Syriac verſion hath it, *Ne jures per Nomen Domini Dei tui cum mendacio*, Thou ſhalt not lye, when thou ſweareſt by the Lord thy God. Now it's a known Rule, that *every Negative ſuppoſeth an Affirmative*: If we are commanded *not to ſwear falſly*, it implies that we *may ſwear truly upon a juſt occaſion.* Wherefore ſaith St. *Auguſtine*, *No body can ſpeak falſly, who ſpeaks not at all*; ſo he *that do's not ſwear, cannot forſwear.* So that if the Quakers make *All* ſwearing vain, they will make the third Commandment inſignificant.

Falſum loqui non poteſt, qui non loquitur; ſic pejerare non poteſt, qui non jurat. Aug. in Serm. Dom. in Mont. lib. 1. p. 1123.

Par. If [*taking the Name of God in vain*] be no more than [*thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf*;] Will not thoſe who take the Name of God *lightly*, *wantonly*, and *irreverently* into their mouths, be encouraged by this expoſition?

Min. When we come to give an account of Scripture, we muſt do it as it is; and muſt not by conſequences of our own make our ſelves wiſer than God: yet I muſt tell you, though [*to take the Name of God in vain*] be only an Hebrew phraſe *to forſwear*; yet is there here no encouragement for wicked men to uſe God's Name *lightly* and *irreverently*; for every time they ſo do, they are guilty of the *vice* of ſwearing, and ſo are included in the breach of this Commandment.

Juramentum vanum eſt, quando quis jurat non neceſſariâ de cauſâ; falſum quando pejerat.

Par. But *T. E.* tells us, *Some things are forbidden, becauſe they are Evil; and ſome things are Evil, becauſe they are forbidden*, ibid.

Min.

Min. [*Some things are forbidden becauſe they are Evil*] implies that *All* things that are Evil are *not forbidden*, this is ſo falſe and irreligious a Principle, that it needs no other confutation than the very naming of it: And [*ſome things are Evil, becauſe forbidden:*] here he ſhould have given an inſtance, where any thing is ſo, *imm-diately* and *directly*. It was *ſo* of old, I confeſs, during the continuance of the Ceremonial Law; but he ſhould have inſtanced where 'tis ſo *now* in the times of the Goſpel.

Par. You have another far-fetch (ſays T.E.) *by which you would prove Oaths Moral, and that it, becauſe they are not Ceremonial.* And *to prove that they are not Ceremonial*, you ſay, *They were uſed by the Patriarchs before the Levitical Law was given.* Whereupon T.E. asks, *Was nothing then Ceremonial, that was uſed by the Patriarchs before the Levitical Law given?* p.142. And this queſtion pleaſes him ſo well that he is at it again, *p.* 150.

Min. To both theſe places I anſwer, When the Quakers ſay, *Oaths are Ceremonial*, they mean, *they are a part of* Moſes *his Law*, and *T. E.* plainly ſays, *p.*134, *they were appointed to them under the Law*; & *Hubberthorn* accounts them *Levitical Ceremonies*; ſo that I may juſtly diſprove their being Ceremonial *in this ſenſe*, becauſe they were uſed by the Patriarchs 400 years before the *Levitical Ceremonies* were given. So that *T. E's.* inference is not ſo *natural* as he dreams it is, when he ſays, *can any thing be more naturally inferr'd, than that I account whatſoever was uſed by the Patriarchs, before the Levitical Law*

Law was given, to be a part of the moral and eternal Law, p. 142.

Par. *Was not* (says he) *Circumcision in the Flesh used before the Levitical Law was given?* ibid. *Were not Beasts sacrificed long before the Levitical Law was given? will you thence conclude that Circumcision, and these Sacrifices are parts of the moral and eternal Law?*

Min. I answer, Neither were they *properly* Levitical Ceremonies; for first, Circumcision (saith Christ) *is not of Moses, but of the Fathers*, *Joh.* 7. 22. And though it be not *Moral*, yet there is a great difference between *that* and *Oaths*: Circumcision hath no reason *in it self*, why it should be observed, nor could the Light of Nature ever have taught it Men, without a Positive institution, which is recorded, *Gen.* 17. But Oaths have a reason *in their own nature*, and the Light of Nature led men to use them long before any Law was given about them: *T.E.* confesses, *the Patriarchs used them*; let him shew what Command they had for so doing (as is evident in the Case of Circumcision) and then Oaths and Circumcision may fall together; but this is impossible, *Therefore* though Circumcision be Ceremonial, Oaths are *not* so.

Secondly, As to Sacrifices, they are believed by all Divines to have had a Positive institution, *viz.* as to the offering things slain; some think God taught this to *Adam*, others to *Noah*; and no Man will say that Sacrifices are Levitical Ceremonies: I grant that Sacrificing *slain Beasts* being *Typical* of Christ was Ceremonial; But Sacrifice as it is the *oblation of some-*

thing

thing to God in acknowledgment of His being Lord of all the World, is a part of *Natural Religion* as well as Oaths; Mortification, *Rom.* 12. 1. *Alms Heb.* 13. 16. and Praiſe *ver.* 15. are called *Sacrifices* in Goſpel Times, and are Eternal Duties; And the Fathers hold, that under the Goſpel the *Kind* is altered, but there are *Chriſtian Sacrifices* ſtill; as I could largely prove were there any need for it. Wherefore an Oath doth not agree with Sacrifices, as they were *inſtituted*, and as they pointed to Chriſt's Death; but as they are an acknowledgment of God's Sovereignty and Bounty, ſo they are a part of Natural Religion, and no Ceremonies, and of the ſame nature and duration with an Oath, both being Moral: And indeed Oaths were never inſtituted, but ſuppoſed; and where they are ſpoken of in the Law or Prophets, are only reſtrained to due circumſtances, and ſet among *Moral Duties*, *Deut.* 6. 13. *Iſa.* 45. 3. *Jer.* 4. 2.

Par. Thus you have made way for your third Propoſition; but *T. E.* will quarrel ſtill at his old rate: And whereas your firſt Argument to prove Oaths *not Ceremonial* was, *becauſe they were not Typical*; this knowing man bids you prove that *all the Ceremonies of* Moſes *Law were Types*, and tell him *what they were Types of*, ſporting himſelf about *Aaron's Breeches*, and the *places* Anointed in a Prieſt's Conſecration. *p.* 145.

Min. If he had more knowledge, he would ſhew leſs Mirth; For St. *Paul* affirms that which *he* doubts of, *Heb.* 9. 9. and 10. 1. and *Juſtin Martyr*,

Martyr, *Origen* and St. *Ambroſe* of Old, with many Modern Authors of great Note, have very Learnedly ſhewed the *Antitypes* in the Goſpel for every *Type* and *Ceremony* of the Law; And are *Theſe* fit to be the objects of *T.* E's ſcorn and laughter? Even by *Aaron's Breeches* was typified that *Modeſty*, which thoſe ought to ſhew who meddle with Holy Things. This Moral thereof *T.E.* is (methinks) as far from *practiſing*, as he is from *underſtanding*: Again, *Exod.* 29. 20. The *blood* was put *on the Tip of the Prieſts Ear*, to ſhew, they ſhould be ready to hear the Commands of God; *on the Thumb*, to ſhew they ſhould lift up holy Hand in God's ſervice; and *on the Toe*, to note an holy Converſation in the Miniſters of the Goſpel.

Par. T.E. may now, if he pleaſe, laugh at his own folly: but the next attempt of his is to find out an *Antitype* for an *Oath*, which muſt typifie ſomething, though other things do not; For he ſays, *This Truth-ſpeaking, this True Witneſs-bearing, this pure Language under the Goſpel, is the Antitype of an Oath*, p. 148.

Min. A Pure invention of the Quakers! As if all that ſware, before Chriſt brought in Truth, were perjured. Juſt now an Oath was a *Mode* of Truth, and now 'tis a *Type* of Truth; Can any thing be a Mode and a Type of the ſame thing? Alms is a Mode of ſhewing mercy, but ſure is no Type of ſhewing mercy; Trying Malefactors before a Judge is a Mode of doing Juſtice, but no Type of doing juſtice. Indeed an Oath is the calling God to Witneſs to a Truth ſpoken, as Prayer is the Calling on Him

to

to ſupply our wants; Now how ſtrange would it be to ſay, Prayer is a Type of the ſupply of our wants without Prayer? yet it is as abſurd to ſay, an *Oath is a Type of Truth-ſpeaking* without an Oath; Beſides, *thus* Type and Antitype would have always gone together, or elſe it was falſe ſwearing; And was Chriſt the Antitype actually ſlain with every Sacrifice that was a Type of him? Surely his Cauſe is bad, when he is put upon ſuch abſurd ſhifts as theſe to defend it.

Par. But *T.E.* comes now to your third Propoſition indeed, *viz. That the reaſon and uſefulneſs of an Oath being perpetual, it muſt be an Eternal duty, and ſo not repealed in the Goſpel.* To this he has nothing to reply more than what relies on his old baffled ſuppoſitions, *viz.* That *Lying and Hypocriſie cannot be the ground or reaſon of what is Eternally good*, p. 151, 152.

Min. I never affirmed they were the *Reaſons*, but the *Occaſions* they may be; The Reaſons of an Oath ought rather to be ſaid to be, God's Omniſcience, and His being the ſupream Judge of the World, a Lover of Truth, and Avenger of all Perjury and Lying; for the Belief of this makes men require an Oath (in matters of moment, wherein Prudence directs them to the greateſt ſecurity that may poſſibly be had) and cauſeth thoſe who take it to fear to profane it: As the reaſon of Juſtice in puniſhing is, that every man may have his deſert, *Ut qui non reddit agendo, reddat patiendo*; but the occaſion is Evil doing. As for the uſefulneſs

neſs of an Oath, when *T.E.* hath found out as good, and great a Security as this is, we will then debate, whether Oaths may be laid aſide. At preſent he ſaith Lying, Hypocriſie &c. are taken away, at leaſt (*de jure* of right) it ought to be ſo, *p.* 153. But then *T. E.* muſt ſtay till his [*de jure*] be turned into [*de facto:*] The Quaker *de jure* ought not to lye and wilfully to miſtake and abuſe my words, but *de facto* he has done it. Would God, all things were as they ought to be; for if we were what we are not, we might omit ſome things now not to be ſpared, as I told you before.

Par. *T.E.* has now *followed you to your fourth Propoſition*, wherein by the Examples of St. *Paul* and an *Angel* who ſwore in the New Teſtament, you undertook to prove, that *All Oaths are not forbidden by Chriſt.* And here I wonder at him, that he falls not upon *all* the inſtances you gave of St. *Paul*'s ſwearing, as in this Caſe (I think) he ought to have done.

Min. 'Tis no wonder to me to find this Quaker omitting any material paſſage in my Book: But as to thoſe inſtances I gave you, they are the trueſt and plaineſt way of interpreting Chriſt's meaning: for if St. *Paul*] *ſwore* in *thoſe* writings which were dictated by the *Holy Ghoſt*, it's plain demonſtration, that *all* Oaths are not forbidden. *For the Apoſtle* (ſaith St. *Auguſtine*) *doubtleſs knew the Command of our Lord, and yet he ſwore* †. And I hope all men will believe that St. *Paul* and the *Holy Ghoſt* are ſafer interpreters of the ſenſe of our Saviour than *T. E.*

† Aug. in Galat.

and *his Spirit*. Now it's ſo plain that St. *Paul* did ſwear, that St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *They are not to be heard, who fanſie theſe are not Oaths which the Apoſtle uſed* ‖.

‖ ibid. ibid.

Now let us examine, why the Apoſtle's words [*God is my Witneſs*, &c. *Rom.* 1.9.] ſhould not paſs for an Oath.

Par. To ſay barely and ſimply God is my Witneſs, is not an Oath (ſaith *T. E.*) *For then God muſt ſwear by Men*, when he ſaith (*Iſa.* 43. 10.) *Ye are my Witneſſes*, &c. *Moſes by Heaven and Earth, and St.* Paul *by the High Prieſt when they ſay, They are Witneſſes; yea the Quaker by* John *and* James *if he ſay, They are his Witneſſes.* p. 155, 156, 157.

Min. I grant firſt, That *every* appeal to God is not an Oath; To appeal to God as a righteous Judge againſt the injuſtice and cruelty of men, without relation to his atteſting and judging of a Propoſition, is no ſwearing by Him. Secondly, That the *citation* of Witneſs is no ſwearing. And Thirdly, That in ſome Caſes men do not ſwear, when they affirm or ſay, that *God is a Witneſs*; thus much I can grant the Quaker: For when I comfort my ſelf againſt falſe accuſations of men, I may ſay, *God is a Witneſs to my innocency*, and yet not be ſaid to ſwear by Him; or when I ſay, *God is a Witneſs of Mens ſecret wickedneſs*, I do not ſwear by Him: But then Divines and Lawyers agree, that *to take God to Witneſs*, and *to appeal to God as the Judge of the truth of what we ſay, and the avenger of the untruth, is ſwearing.* In which reſpect this paſſage of St. *Paul*'s is accounted

counted an Oath; which he thought neceſſary, as being the greateſt aſſurance he could give the *Romans* of his charity and zeal for them; *God is my Witneſs*, &c. *that without ceaſing I make mention of you always in my prayers* *, wherefore St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, what ſignifies [*by God*] but [*God is Witneſs?*] and what means [*God is Witneſs,*] but [*by God*] *Serm.* 28. *de verb. Apoſt.* To, &c. *To call God to Witneſs is to ſwear*, ſaith the ſame St. *Auguſtine*; and ſo *Chryſoſtom* †; ſo all the School-men, ſo our Modern Divines, ſo both Jews and Heathens define an Oath. But do's it at all follow, that becauſe it is no ſwearing to Call a Creature to Witneſs, therefore it's none to call the Creator to Witneſs ‖? To Petition God is Divine Worſhip, is it *therefore* Divine Worſhip to Petition the King? No, let the Quaker know, It's Eſſential to an Oath, to Call ſomewhat to Witneſs, that we believe to be a God.

* Rom. 1. 9.

Jurat, qui adhibet Deum teſtem. Aug. de Serm. Dom. in Mont. l. 2. p. 1124. and in Pſal. 109.

† Chryſ. Homil. in Act. 9.

‖ See p. 160.

Par. Now *T. F.* comes to your next inſtance [*Rom.* 9. 1. *I ſay the truth in Chriſt, I lye not, my Conſcience alſo bearing me Witneſs in the Holy Ghoſt.*] To this He anſwers, *To ſpeak the truth in Chriſt is not an Oath*, &c. p. 157. *If* Paul *ſhould have ſworn as oft as he ſpake the Truth in Chriſt, he would have been a very Common ſwearer*, p. 158.

Min. It's very true, that every time we ſpeak the Truth in Chriſt we do not ſwear; but as the phraſe ſtands here, it can be accounted nothing elſe but an Oath; Which will be more evident to this great Critick and

Judge in Translations, if he observe, that in Greek it is [ἐν χριστῷ] which he knows may justly be Translated [*by Christ*;] for he is not ignorant, I hope, that in St. *Mat.* 5.34,35,36. where we read--*By Heaven--by Earth--by thy Head---* (*Per Cælum--per Terram---per Caput tuum*, as *Beza* has it) which are plain swearing: yet there the Original is the same Preposition as here--ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ-- ἐν τῇ γῇ--ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου· And *Eph.* 4. 17. where we read [*And testifie in the Lord,*] *Beza* hath *Obtestor per Dominum*, the Greek being μαρτύρομαι ἐν κυρίῳ, and I am sure there are very many instances in Scripture, where [ἐν] is translated [*by*] and where it is used in swearing; So that if we read it [*I say the truth* by *Christ*, &c.] as we may do; then it will admit of no dispute. I shall only add, that this [*I say the truth in Christ, I lye not*] was appointed by an Old English Council † to be the Priests and Deacons form of swearing before the Altar.

† Concil. Berkhamsted. cap. 18. Spelm. Anno. 700.

As to the second part of the Sentence, St. *Paul* swears not by his Conscience, which was not *his God*, but only professeth the agreement of this Protestation to the sense of his Soul, and to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, with which he was inspired, unless we translate [ἐν] *by* the Holy Ghost, and make it another Oath, *viz. by the Holy Spirit.*

Par. Though *T. E.* did not consult his Greek Testament in this instance, yet in your next he did; For whereas you propounded 2 *Cor.* 1.18. [*but as God is true*, &c.] to this he replies,

plies, *The particle* [*as*] *is not in the Greek, but put in by the Tranſlator*, ibid.

Min. What then? Who knows not that the Jews did always leave out [*As*] in their Oaths; and yet always it was to be underſtood; I ſuppoſe *T. E.* will grant [*As the Lord liveth*] to be an Oath, yet [*As*] is never in the Original, but always put in by the Tranſlator, as he may underſtand by [*as*] being printed in a ſmaller Letter, *Jud.* 8.19. and 1 *Sam.* 20. 3. 2 *Sam.* 15.21. 2 *Kings* 3. 14, &c. And whereas *T. E.* would have us read it in *Tomſon's* Traſlation, [*Yea God is faithful,*] He muſt know that if he leave out [*As*] it will be an Oath ſtill; For *Jer.* 5. 2. *Though they ſay, the Lord liveth, ſurely they ſwear falſly*: where the Prophet ſaith, they did *ſwear*, who only ſaid, *The Lord liveth* without [*As.*] Surely it's as much an Oath in this inſtance of St. *Paul* to ſay [*God is Faithful,*] as in the other to ſay [*the Lord liveth,*] All the difference is, they whom *Jeremy* mentions ſwore *falſly*, but St. *Paul* truly. And indeed it is but an *Hebraiſm* to leave [*as*] out, for it muſt be underſtood, or elſe it is not a full ſenſe.

Par. I obſerve that *T. E.* finds himſelf pincht by this inſtance, for he allows the words of St. *Paul* to be a *ſolemn aſſeveration*, ibid.

Min. A ſolemn Aſſeveration here is a *Religious aſſeveration*, which makes it amount to an Oath: However I thought the Quakers had allowed of no Aſſeverations beyond [*Yea*] and [*Nay,*] but accounted them as bad as Oaths: So that this evaſion will help him but a little.

But do you not obſerve how cloſe he crouds together the remaining inſtances? And though St. *Paul* ſolemnly appeals to the Omniſcience of the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt as a Witneſs, who knew he did not lye, 2 *Cor.* 11. 31. This is no Oath with *T. E.*; No nor that 2 *Cor.* 1. 23. where he plainly Calls God to Witneſs, and (knowing it to be true) offers up his Soul to ſuffer by God's Juſtice, if it were not as he ſaid, This is no ſwearing with *T.E.* neither; but he only ſays it, but cannot prove it; So that till he can prove theſe are no Oaths, I ſhall take it for granted.

But I gave you one inſtance *Gal.* 1. 20. [*Behold before God I lye not.*] which is ſo plain an Oath, that the Quaker (according to his own expreſſion) *was not hardy enough to venture on it*, nor ſo much as to mention it in his Book. Now if St. *Paul* did ſwear, though but once, when he writ by the Holy Ghoſt (*though it was not in his riper years, when he had made a further progreſs in the Chriſtian Religion* †) it muſt neceſſarily follow, that *All* ſwearing is not forbidden by Chriſt under the Goſpel.

† See *T.E.* 4 5. 46.

Par. Now *T.E.* comes to produce ſome Probabilities, *that the Apoſtle did not ſwear.*

Min. Probabilities are not good Arguments againſt matters of Fact; But pray, let us hear what they are.

Par. Firſt he thinks it abſurd, *that the Apoſtle upon no greater occaſion than recounting to the* Corinthians *the manner of his eſcape out*

of

of Damascus *through a Window into a Basket, should take a solemn Oath by God, that he did not lye*, p. 160. 2 Cor. 11.

Min. Certainly he is not so stupid, as to *think* as he writes here; For nothing can be more plain, than that the Oath I mentioned in the 31 *verse*, relates to the precedent passages in the *Chapter*. There were false Apostles at *Corinth*, who had brought the Apostle's Credit so low among them, that he is forced to *commend himself*, *ver.* 5, 6. and to shew that he was not inferiour to those false Apostles, either in any Legal Prerogative, or in the Service of Christ, or in any kind of suffering for his Ministry; So that here was sufficient occasion to require the solemnity of an Oath, to give the greater assurance to the *Corinthians* of his Commission for Apostleship, which they then call'd into question, and required him to prove that he had received it from Christ, 2 *Cor.* 13. 3. And in *Galatia* too, some of these deceivers had wrought the like evil perswasions in the people. *He saw some there who did not believe*, saith St. *Augustine* ‖. And the Apostle knowing their salvation depended upon their believing his Doctrine and Commission, uses the solemnity of Oaths to Convince them; being compelled thereto by their Unbelief, and by his Desire to preserve them from Apostacy and Damnation; And sure this was a sufficient occasion. Gal 1. 7. ‖Serm. 30. de verb. Apost.

Par. He supposes you have given him advantage, by saying, *That the Pharisees taught, that it was lawful to swear at any time by God's*

Name, ſo that they ſwore nothing but truth, &c. *which you acknowledge Chriſt prohibited.* And further he ſays, *Biſhop* Gauden *makes the Lawful Call of Authority, one of the due circumſtances which are neceſſary in a Lawful Oath,* and that your ſelf ſhould ſay, *The Uſe and Lawfulneſs of ſwearing, which remains, is, when a Man is called by lawful Authority to declare his Conſcience, in order to the ending of any Controverſie, wherein his evidence may be concerned. Now then* (ſays he) *let us conſider, If* Paul *had ſworn, who called him to it? Who required it of him? Nay, what lawful Authority had the* Corinthians *over him to require an Oath of him?* &c. p. 160, 161.

Min. As to the *Firſt*, it will not advantage his Cauſe at all, unleſs he could prove that I ever ſaid, that St. *Paul* ſwore either by the Creatures, or by God in ordinary converſe. For the ſum of what I ſaid was, that ſwearing *by the Creatures*, though *falſly*, and *by God* at any time in ordinary Converſe, if but truly, was allowed by the Phariſees: and that *againſt the firſt of them*, viz. *ſwearing by the Creature, Chriſt oppoſeth that prohibition*, Mat. 5. 34 35, 36. *But I ſay unto you ſwear not at all, neither by Heaven*, &c. *Againſt the later*, viz. *ſwearing by the Name of God in our ordinary converſe, he gives this precept*, ver. 37. *Let your Communication be yea yea, nay nay*, &c.

See Fr. Conf. p. 77, 78.

Secondly, If Biſhop *Gauden* makes the lawful Call of Authority *one* of the due Circumſtances, which are neceſſary in a lawful Oath; it do's not follow, that he allows *no other* circumſtances. Nor *Thirdly*,

Thirdly, Do I any where in all my Book ſay, *there is no other uſe of an Oath, but in Judicatories*, as he here ſuggeſts cunningly, making two Propoſitions of one, and ſo perverting the ſenſe of my words, which were theſe, *viz. the uſe and lawfulneſs of ſwearing remains (i.e.)* continues; Or more plainly, Oaths continue lawful, though not in Common Converſe, yet) *when I am called by lawful Authority to declare my Conſcience in order to the ending of any Controverſie, wherein my evidence may be concern'd.* If I had ſaid, *the uſe and lawfulneſs of ſwearing, which remains, it when*, &c. as he quotes it; then indeed he had had ſome ſhew of reaſon to *imply* here, and *expreſly to ſay*, p. 164. that the only Lawful Uſe that I give of ſwearing now under the Goſpel is in Judicatories, *&c.* But ſeeing no ſuch inference can be deduced from them as they are ſet down in the *Conference*, Where is *T. E*'s ſincerity? Where is his honeſty thus to pervert my words? Is this the way to prove himſelf an adherent to Chriſtianity, which he tells us, *p.* 131. *hath made it's Adherents ſo upright, juſt and true, that they dare not ſpeak a falſhood, though others dare ſwear it?* I confeſs indeed that the *Main* Uſe of an Oath is in Judicatories, but not the *only* uſe; for we may ſwear in a very weighty Caſe, when we cannot otherwiſe be believed, and when it will be very prejudicial to them that hear us, if they do not believe; So St. *Auguſtine* of his own practice, *When I ſee I am not believed without an Oath, and that it is very inexpedient to him that believes*

See Fr. Conf. p. 84.

lieves me not, weighing this reaſon, and taking good conſideration, I ſay with great Reverence [*Before God*] *or* [*God is Witneſs*] *or* [*Chriſt knows it to be ſo in my Soul*†.] Oaths are uſeful likewiſe in *Dedicating* our ſelves to God, *&c.* (as I told you before.) And for my part I ſhall ſubſcribe to the Opinion of Biſhop *Hooper* (whom *Ellwood* himſelf calls a *Godly Martyr*) That the two bleſſed Sacraments (as you have heard ‖) are both *Vows* and *Oaths*, being therefore called *Sacraments*; That on God's part they are *Seals*, but on our part *Oaths* of Allegiance and Fidelity.

† Aug. de verb. Apoſt. Ser. 30.

‖ See p. 46.

Now then let the Quaker conſider, how impertinent his Queries of St. *Paul* are, *p.* 161. *Who called him to it? Who required it of him? &c.* That the Apoſtle had ſufficient occaſions to ſwear, I have ſhewed you before; Nor can the Quaker prove from any thing I have ſaid, that I confine *All* Lawful ſwearing to Judicatories.

Par. But he ſays, *If in theſe inſtances* Paul *had ſworn, he had not ſworn judicially and legally, but in his ordinary Communication, which kind of ſwearing is acknowledged to be forbidden by Chriſt*, p. 164.

Min. T. E. is out again; Is *writing Epiſtles* ordinary Communication? It was in his *Writing* that St. *Paul* ſwore, and not in his *Ordinary* Writing neither, but in that which the Holy Ghoſt dictated. And St. *Auguſtine* notes, *the Apoſtle might better weigh his expreſſions when he was Writing, than if he had been ſpeaking.* Tis true, St. *Paul* ſwore *out of*

a

a Court of Judicature, but not without a great Neceſſity. And I think it's a good Argument, that he would have been much more ready to have done ſo in a Court of Judicature, if there had been occaſion, and he legally call'd to it. Certainly he would have ſcrupled no more in *taking* an Oath than in *tendering* one, as we find he did, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 27. *I charge you by the Lord*, Where the Greek is ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς, that is (as in the Margine) *I adjure*, or *I ſwear you.*

Par. Whereas you told me, that *in every one of theſe inſtances St.* Paul *makes a moſt ſolemn appeal to God as Witneſs of what he affirms, and Judge of his ſincerity*; he anſwers, *If to appeal to God, be to ſwear by God, then by the ſame reaſon to appeal to Man, or any other thing (in the ſame tenſe) is to ſwear by that Man or thing, that is ſo appealed to*, p. 163.

Min. Every Appeal to God (as I granted before) is not indeed an Oath; but then ſurely, *When we Appeal to God in a moſt ſolemn manner as Witneſs of what we affirm, and Judge of our ſincerity* (as St. *Paul* I told you in theſe inſtances did) it cannot be interpreted leſs than an Oath. If this be not ſwearing, I know not what it is; And indeed I wonder why the Quakers inveigh againſt us here in *England* for ſwearing, when according to *Ellwood*'s Principles (*if St.* Paul *ſwore not*) there is no ſuch thing among us. See Fr. Conf. I. 70, 71.

As for his old fallacy, that [*to appeal to God is not an Oath, becauſe to appeal to Man, or any other thing is not to ſwear by that Man*

or

or thing] it hath been ſufficiently baffled already, and is as much non-ſenſe as to ſay, " It is not blaſphemy to ſay *God is Mortal*, becauſe it is not blaſphemy to ſay, a *Man* or a *Horſe is mortal*.

Par. But becauſe you ſaid, *thoſe mentioned Forms uſed by St.* Paul, *were as poſitive Oaths, as any other uſed in the Bible*, here he takes advantage of your calling an Oath a *Form*, and ſeems to wonder that *you will not have it* therefore a *Ceremony*, ibid.

Min. Here's another fallacy; Do I in any part of my Book make [*form*] the *genus* of an Oath? or ſuppoſe I had; Are all *forms* Ceremonies? The Apoſtle recommends to *Timothy* a *Form of ſound words* (of which you have had an account) that is, *ſound Doctrine*; Will therefore this Quaker accuſe the Apoſtle of calling the *Chriſtian Doctrine* but a *Ceremony*? He himſelf ſaith, *p.* 118. *there is Juſtice and the manner of doing Juſtice, there is Mercy and the way of ſhewing Mercy, there is Truth and the manner of ſpeaking Truth.* So ſay I, there is an *Oath*, and there is the *way* and *manner* or *form* (which is all one) of *expreſſing an Oath*; Of theſe forms I produced ſeveral both out of the Old and New Teſtament. Now I may as juſtly accuſe *T. E.* of making *Juſtice* and *Mercy* to be but *Ceremonies*, as he accuſe me in this paſſage of making an *Oath* to be *no more*.

Par. Reaſon will not help the Quaker, and now he flies to Authority to prove that St. *Paul* did not ſwear, which he introduces with

with this formality, *But that he and all may see, it is not our judgment only that* Paul *did not swear, I here produce two very Authentick Witnesses to clear* Paul *from swearing. The first is* Basil, *firnamed the great, who himself refused to swear at the Council of* Chalcedon.---

Min. I must interrupt you a little, and tell you, that though I do acknowledge St. *Basil* a very great and good Man; yet I must not prefer his *single suffrage*, before the determination of a *General Council*, especially that of *Chalcedon* consisting of 630. Bishops. It seems the Council required an Oath, and *Basil* (he says) *refused it*; Now whether *He* or the *Council* was greater, or *more Authentick*, let any man of sense judge. But what if I tell you that the Quaker or his Spirit has wrong'd St. *Basil*, and that this relation is false?

Par. Surely it cannot.

Min. If he refused to swear at the Council of *Chalcedon*, it was *Ellwood* that Conjur'd him up; For *Basil* firnamed the *Great* was above threescore and ten years in his Grave, before that Council sate, He dying in the Reign of *Valens* the Emperor about the year of Christ 378, and that Council called in the year 451. This is affirmed not only by *Helvicus* †, but *Baronius* and several others: But if this will not satisfie *T. E.* he may consult his Friend *Rider*, who says as much almost as this in his Dictionary.

† See his Chronology.

Par. I know not what to say to this, and can the less excuse him, because I suppose, he pretends to write by the dictates of the Spirit

rit——But to let this pass; St. *Basil*'s words, as they are cited here by *T. E.* to prove, that *Paul* did not swear, are these, *There are some Speeches which have the Forms of Oaths, and yet are no Oaths at all, but rather Remedies to perswade. He instances in* Joseph *and the Apostle* Paul, *of which last he saith, The Apostle willing to shew his love to the* Corinthians *said, By the Glorying of you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, &c.* 1 Cor. 15. 31. p. 165.

Min. In the *first* place I must desire you to take notice, that in St. *Basil*'s opinion, there is an *Oath*, and the *Form* of an Oath. *Secondly*, observe, that this is none of the instances which I gave of St. *Paul*'s swearing, and so doth not oppose the Examples I brought: yet here must I tell you, that St. *Augustin* (who was as *Authentick a Witness*, and as glorious a Light as ever shone in the Church of Christ since the Apostles days) not only *says*, this very phrase is an Oath, but *proves* it too (which is more than St. *Basil* doth) by the Greek particle [Νὴ] here used, *which* (saith he) *every one knows is the common particle of swearing among the Greeks*; νὴ τὸν Θεὸν, *ubi dixerit Græcus, jurat* †. Nay *Erasmus* (whom *T. E.* quotes against Lawful Oaths, *p.* 130.) produceth St. *Augustin*'s opinion (as well as I do) to prove this an Oath; And immediately adds, *There's no reason why we should wrangle, and deny that the Apostle swore here, seeing that elsewhere,* NOT IN A FEW PLACES HE

† Aug. verb. Apost. Ser. 28, 30.

HE PLAINLY SWEARS ‖. *Thirdly*, T.E. confesses (and that truly) that St. *Basil* in the same place affirmeth *Joseph*'s words, *By the Life of* Pharaoh, were no Oath; yet in this, I suppose, the very Quakers are hardly of his mind. But more of St. *Basil* hereafter.

‖ Citat huncloc. cum & Augustinus Epist 89. Rursum copiosius Serm. de verb. Apost. 28. ostendens hoc loco juraſſe Paulum, idq; liquere ex Græcis exemplaribus. Nec eſt quod tergiverſemur, & negemus Apoſtolum juraſſe, quum alibi non paucis locis palam juret. Eraſm. Annot. in 1 Cor. 15. 31.

Par. The other Witneſs is Gregory Nazianzen, *in his Dialogue againſt ſwearing, thus.* B. *But* Paul *alſo ſwore, as they ſay.* A. *Who ſaid ſo? O what a vain jaugler was he that ſaid it! quoth he;* [*God is my Witneſs,*] *and* [*God knoweth,*] *Thoſe words are not an Oath, but a certain Aſſeveration,* &c. ibid.

Min. Obſerve here the fraudulent dealing of this Quaker; for whereas the Title of *Nazien*'s Poem here cited, is Πρὸς πολυόρκους Διάλογος *Jamb.* 20. *p.* 224. *A Dialogue againſt Common* or *frequent ſwearers*, the Quaker cunningly changes it into——*againſt ſwearing*——as if it were againſt *All* Oaths in general; But what ſaith this Dialogue? Why, the Perſon with whom he diſcourſeth, ſaith; B. *They ſay* (that is the Common ſwearers of thoſe times) *that* Paul *ſwore.* A. asks *who ſaid ſo?* Ὡς λῆρός τις ὤν, *he was a trifler*, or *it was but a trifle*; that is, Their Authority was not very valuable. But to the Matter.

I reply, *Gregory Nazianzen* do's not disapprove of *all* Oaths in this piece of Poetry, but he is arguing against *Common Swearing*; And whereas these Common Swearers alledged the Examples of God and St. *Paul*, both taking Oaths, *Nazianzen* denies, *that God did ever swear* (which I doubt *T.E.* cannot fully agree with him in) and then denies, *that St.* Paul *did swear.*

Now it being *so plain*, that God did swear (as also in my opinion, that St. *Paul* did swear) I cannot reconcile *Nazianzen* to Reason, if he mean *absolutely*; and therefore his sense must be, that God and St. *Paul never swore as these Common Swearers do*, and that it was λῆρος *a trifle* to alledge their Examples, considering they never swore at all, as Customary Swearers do: Let any Man read the whole Dialogue, and he will be convinced, this is the design of it. But I shall more fully prove, that *Nazianzen* is not of the Quakers side, when we speak to *p.* 286. where *T.E.* quotes him again.

Par. Next he comes to your *last instance of the Angel swearing*, *Rev.* 10. 5, 6. And seeing he cannot deny the Fact, he catches at your expression, *that we need not fear to imitate any thing that is done in Heaven*, &c. for (says he) *this was not done in Heaven, but on Earth*, p. 166.

Min. I did dot say, that the Angel *was in Heaven*, when he swore; and the Quaker must know, that by [*Heaven*] 'tis an usual *Trope* to understand the *inhabitants of Heaven*, as in that of the Lords Prayer (which I there cited)

cited) [*Thy will be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven*] we mean——by men, as it is by Angels; So that my meaning plainly is, We need not fear to imitate any thing done by those of *Heaven*: Now this Angel came from Heaven, *vers.* 1. and was a good Angel of Heaven; wheresoever He *stood* therefore makes nothing to our purpose, it being sufficient that a good Angel did it. And in S^t. *Ambrose*'s * Opinion, This Angel was Christ himself; wherefore an Oath cannot be suppos'd unlawful, having even in Gospel Times so notable a President of one who did actually swear.

* S. Ambr. in loc.

Par. But *T. E.* says, *We must not imitate the Angels in all things, for one of them offer'd Incense, which is abolished by Christ, as the concurrent judgement* (he says) *and practice of all Parties confirms.* p. 167.

Min. If all the Christians in the World were divided into three parts, two of them do use Incense (in their worship) at this day: I do not mention this to justifie the practice, but to shew with what confidence the Quaker prattles, as if it were the *concurrent judgment of all Parties.* Besides, there is a vast difference between Types and Ceremonies, which cease of themselves, when the substance is come, and such things as are under a positive prohibition; Circumcision, abstaining from blood, and things strangled, were Ceremonies, yet were they connived at, in the early times of Christianity: But had they been under a positive prohibition, it had been a damnable sin afterwards to have allowed them in any

caſe: So the uſing of Incenſe in Divine Service is Ceremonious, but had it been as expreſly forbidden, as the Quakers pretend all ſwearing is, the Angel had fallen into ſin, (and conſequently from his State) by uſing it. So that the Quakers inſtance here comes infinitely ſhort of the caſe.

However I ſhall add, that the Apocalypſe, or Book of Revelation is myſtical, one part whereof deſcribeth the things of Chriſtianity alluſively to *Moſes*'s Tabernacle, and *Solomon*'s Temple; on this account the offering of Incenſe is there introduced, to ſignifie that which it is a ſymbol of; but the Angel's Oath is no ſymbol of any thing, therefore not only allowable but uſeful in Goſpel times.

Par. You ſaid, *that if there were that truth in men, that their bare teſtimony were of ſufficient credit, then there were no need at all of an Oath, and yet* (ſays he) *would you fetch an inſtance from Heaven of ſwearing? If there were not truth enough among men, do you think there is not truth enough in Angels neither, to make their bare teſtimony of ſufficient Credit?* p. 176.

Min. God and the Angel did ſwear meerly in condeſcenſion to the weakneſſes and infirmities of men, to give us the higheſt aſſurance either of God Almighty's Mercy, or Juſtice; therefore whenſoever they ſware, it was wholly upon our account.

Par. T. E. tells us, that he *would go directly to the two Texts in* Matthew *and* James, *but for a paſſage or two which lie in his way: The firſt* is, that you ſhould ſay, *that every*

Oath implies an Execration, that is, a curſing or betaking ones ſelf to the Devil (as Rider *expounds the word) which makes an Oath more unſuitable to the nature of the Goſpel*, &c. p. 169.

Min. If an Execration be not implied in every Oath, then is the Oath it ſelf excuſeable, the fault will only lye at my door, for making ſuch an aſſertion: But if every Oath do's really imply an Execration, and the true notion of an Execration is *a curſing or betaking ones Soul to the Devil*; then an Oath was as unſuitable to the Law, as it can be to the Goſpel: ſo that the Quaker's Argument will fall every way to the ground.

Neither do's *Rider* ſay, it is a Curſing and a Betaking——*but Curſing or Betaking*——For there are Execrations which are a betaking our ſelves to the Juſtice of God, in caſe we falſifie: And ſuch are the Execrations imply-ed in the Oaths we take.

Now that ſuch Execrations are underſtood in every Oath, was the Opinion of *Plutarch*, and the incomparably Learned, and no leſs Judicious Biſhop *Sanderſon*, whom before I quoted. S^t. *Auguſtine* is of this judgement alſo; *For* (ſays he) *what we mention in ſwearing, we bind it over to God, namely to ſuffer if we falſifie* *. And the ſame is affirmed by *Cornelius à Lapide* on *Rom.* 14. 11. by *Fuller* in *Miſcel. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. by *Grotius de Jure Belli*, and many more.

* Aug. de Verb. Apoſt. Ser. 130.

If need were I could quote ſeveral forms of Heathen Oaths, and of Chriſtian Oaths out of

our own Hiſtorians, where the Execration hath been expreſt, *Ita me Dieſpiter ejiciat ut ego hunc lapidem*, in his beloved *Polybius*;——But I need not inſtance in a thing ſo generally known as this is.

Par. But whereas you added, *that Execration is implied and underſtood even in thoſe Elliptical forms of ſwearing uſed by God himſelf*; *this* (he ſays) *he cannot brook that you ſhould thus charge God with uſing an Execration (that is, wiſhing a curſe upon himſelf) which how great a blaſphemy it is againſt God, will appear, if we conſider that it tends to make the moſt high God acknowledge ſome other Being ſuperiour to himſelf*; *for he who execrates (or wiſheth a curſe upon) himſelf, doth thereby own a power above himſelf, which is able to bring, or execute that curſe upon him.* ibid.

Min. I hope you are ſenſible that the notion he has of [*Execration*] is utterly falſe, that indeed no ſuch thing is implied by it, as to *betake ones Soul to the Devil*; ſo that it is no wonder to ſee the Quaker throwing down the *Jack Straw* which himſelf hath made.

Had he conſulted Biſhop *Sanderſon*, he would have found ſufficient reaſons given by him for this Aſſertion: However I muſt tell *T. E.* that God in ſwearing (as in ſome other things) follows the manner of men, and his Oaths are Elliptical in the Hebrew tongue, as well as mens, in which ſomething muſt be underſtood to make up the ſenſe, and that which is ſo underſtood, is an Execration. Of this we have a plain example in *Pſal.* 95. 11. *So I ſware in my wrath* [*If*] *they ſhall enter into my reſt*; (for

(for ſo it is in the Hebrew, as both you and *T. E.* may be informed from the *marg.*) [*If*] what then? ſomewhat muſt neceſſarily be underſtood: Let *Vatablus* here teach the Quaker how to fill up the ſenſe: *If* (ſays he) *is a particle of ſwearing among the Hebrews, and they underſtand* [*let this or that happen to me.*] Vatab. in loc.

The Children of *Iſrael* (you know) had grieved God forty years in the wilderneſs; had in the higheſt affront to His Majeſty ſet up a filthy Idol, moſt ingratefully murmured againſt him, and brought up an evil report on that good Land whither he was carrying them, wherefore *He ſware in his wrath that* [*if*] *any of them entered into his reſt* (that is, poſſeſſed the Land of *Canaan*, except *Joſhua* and *Caleb*) &c. Now in the [If] here conſiſts the Elipſis, and the ſenſe muſt be made out by our ſuppoſition, which will run after this manner: *If they enter into my Reſt, if ever they have any thing to do in the Land of* Canaan, *then let that Calf they made be thought their God, and have the honour of bringing them out of the Land of* Egypt: *I have ſworn they ſhall never enter my Reſt, which if they ever do, let me be accounted a lyar, and for ever forfeit the honour of my Veracity.* Here's now the Execration: And does the High God in this acknowledge *ſome other Being ſuperiour to himſelf?* &c. Now I would know what evil this can be to God, who (it's true) can incurr no evil, becauſe he cannot falſifie? Suppoſe a True Man, that knows the thing he ſpeaks to be right, ſhould (for the confirmation of them who doubt) ſay, *If I be*

a lyar, let me ſuffer as a lyar? Here's an Execration: Now what Chriſtian precept doth it oppoſe? or which way is it unſuitable to the nature and purity of the Goſpel?

S^t. *Paul* did execrate himſelf conditionally, *Rom.* 9. 3. *I could wiſh my ſelf* (ſays he) *were accurſed from Chriſt, for my Brethren, my Kinſmen according to the fleſh*, &c.

So that *T. E.* needed not to have made ſo many black inferences from my words, unleſs he intended to give thereby a clearer and fuller demonſtration of his own impertinencies, and wrangling diſpoſition.

But to retort his own words with ſome little variation. *By this you may ſee what horrid abſurdities that wiſdom which deſcendeth not from above, but is earthly and ſenſual, runs (not the Learned Rabbies but) the unlearned Quakers into.*

Par. The other paſſage of yours which *lies in his way*, is this; you ſaid, that *the laying on of the hand, and kiſſing of the Book, were no eſſential parts of an Oath, but only decent and comely Ceremonies.* p. 170.

Min. As for laying on of the hand, kiſſing the Book, *&c.* however they may be ſerviceable to affect the mind with ſo ſolemn and ſerious a buſineſs; yet indeed are they but ſo many circumſtances, and concern not at all the nature of an Oath. For if to appeal to God as witneſs of our hearts and actions, is not an Oath, (as *T. E.* tells us) ſurely then to lay the hand on the Book, and kiſs it, cannot paſs for ſwearing, even in the Quakers own account.

Pag. 156, and 163.

Par.

Par. He wiſhes here *that the Magiſtrates in all Counties would read this, and reflect upon thoſe many great Fines, and ſore Impriſonments inflicted by ſome of them, upon many of the Quakers, even to the loſs of life, for not complying with thoſe things which are by you aſſerted to be no eſſential parts of an Oath, but bare Ceremonies.* ibid.

Min. Do the Quakers then ſuffer for ſuch things as are meerly indifferent? who do they think will thank 'em for it another day? or will it not be ſaid to them at the great day, Who required this at your hands? It's the Cauſe which makes a Martyr: And it's not barely ſuffering *Fines, Impriſonments, or Death* it ſelf that God accepts, for there are ſufferers of all Opinions: Filthy *Mahomet* has not wanted thoſe that have died for him. Chriſt (it's true) ſaith, *Bleſſed are they which are perſecuted,* but then he adds, *for Righteouſneſs ſake. And though I give my Body to be burned and have not Charity, it profiteth me nothing,* 1 Cor. 13. 3.

See *Turkiſh* Hiſt. p. 284. Mat. 5. 10.

Kiſſing then and laying the hand upon the Book, being by all ſides accounted no eſſential parts of an Oath: My wonder then is, what the Quaker here aims at, unleſs it be to prove his own Party croſs and peeviſh, who it ſeems do obſtinately ſuffer for that, wherein our Saviour's prohibition is no ways concerned.

Par. However he *hopes that the Magiſtrates for the future will be induced to exerciſe more moderation and gentleneſs, and not to expoſe their honeſt Neighbours to ſo great ſufferings for*

meer Ceremonies, when the ſumme and ſubſtance is effectually anſwered by their ſpeaking the plain and naked Truth in the preſence of God. Ibid.

Min. We can ſpeak no where, but in the preſence of God: what ſecurity is this to the Magiſtrate? every lyar ſpeaks in the preſence of God: *For where can he flee from his preſence?* Pſal. 139.

Par. I ſuppoſe *T. E*'s meaning is, That if the Magiſtrates will diſpenſe with their *kiſſing of the Book*, &c. they will aſſure them, that what they ſpeak is *the plain and naked truth*, as they are in the preſence of God.

Min. This either is his meaning, or elſe he plainly equivocates; wherefore let us take the Quaker in the beſt ſenſe, and ſuppoſe that he equivocates not, yet here muſt I tell him, that ſpeaking thus in the preſence of God is the *ſumme and ſubſtance of an Oath.* This reminds me of a paſſage which happen'd ſome few years ago: The King and Council order, That all perſons in any Military Imployment ſhould be obliged to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, otherwiſe to quit the Service. An ignorant Souldier (who was a Papiſt, as the ſtory goes) conſults his Confeſſor whether he might take the Oaths? who told him, that he might take the Oath of Allegiance, but not that of Supremacy: But it ſeems this Souldier underſtood him quite wrong, and when he came to ſwear, took the Oath of Supremacy, but abſolutely refuſed the Oath of Allegiance, for which he was caſheir'd. No leſs ignorant are the Quakers, who it ſeems

do

do not really ſcruple *the ſumme and ſubſtance* of an Oath, but at the form and manner of taking it. To ſpeak thus in the preſence of God, *i. e.* to appeal to him as a witneſs of their ſincerity, is what (it ſeems) they dare yield unto: but to lay their hands on the Book and kiſs it, (though *T. E.* calls it a meer Ceremony) yet is it ſo enormous, that they will rather ſuffer *Fines*, *Impriſonments* (nay what not) than they will do it: Now how ridiculous this is, let all of even common ſenſe and reaſon judge and determine. However if the Magiſtrates will be content to take the Quakers Oaths, without kiſſing of the Book, I am willing that they have my ſuffrage (if it might ſignifie any thing) for a diſpenſation.

Par. At length T. E. *is come to thoſe two notable Texts*, Mat. 5. 34. *Swear not at all*; *and* Jam. 5. 12. *above all things my Brethren ſwear not: Theſe* (ſays he) *ſtand like two immoveable Rocks, againſt which all the contenders for ſwearing have hitherto been ſpat: Theſe two Biſhop* Gawden *confeſſeth to be notable Texts, which ſeem to ſtand as the Angel of the Lord againſt* Balaam, *&c.* p. 170, 171.

Min. If big ſwelling words be true Arguments, I muſt then acknowledge my Book baffl'd to all intents and purpoſes: But I muſt deſire the Quaker to take notice (as fiercely as he lays about him) that Biſhop *Gawden* doth not ſay that theſe Texts do really ſtand, *&c.* but *ſeem to ſtand*——that is, not to knowing and conſiderative men, but to ſuch as *T. E.*

who

who takes a *Bush* for a *Bear*; which makes me recall a saying which I heard from the mouth of that Reverend and Pious Prelate: *Alas* (said he) *our Dissenters may be truly compared to boggling horses, which start and boggle at that which will do them no harm at all.*——

But now that he has got to those Texts, let me enquire of you, whether you have compared the account I gave you of them, with *T. E*'s reflections together?

Par. I have so, and do find that he has not dealt fairly with you; for whereas you compared *Mat.* 5. 34. with *Titus* 3. 2. shewing that the words would not admit a general interpretation, but must be limited to a particular sense; he takes no manner of notice thereof: yet because you said, *That our Lord must not be supposed to have forbidden all manner of Oaths, because of* St. Paul's *and the Angel's swearing*; This he *conceives is sufficiently disproved and enervated already.* p. 172.

Min. I hope you sufficiently see that this is a meer *Bravado*; and also, that not only here but all along, the most considerable passages of my Book are omitted. Now I desire to know where he undertook to disprove that the Angel swore? He pretends indeed in the place where he is treating about it, to excuse the action, as if it were done in conformity to the Law, because another Angel used a Censor: But how come our Saviour's words to be a general prohibition? If so, the Angels had been included, and consequently (as I before noted) had fall'n from their state, had they

transi-

tranſgreſſed it. So that you may ſee, with what pitiful ſhifts the Quaker goes about to evade the Truth, and will perſiſt in his Error, though indeed an Angel ſtand in his way.

Par. But *T. E.* ſaith, that you *meanly beg a conceſſion that an Oath is morally good*, &c. Ibid.

Min. I begg'd no ſuch thing, but proved it from the nature and end of an Oath; as I have done even now from the Third Commandment.

Par. Why then did you make way *to hook it in, under the notion of indifferency*, as *T. E.* tells us? whereupon he triumphs not a little, and ſays, *You come down a pace, who from calling it an act of Natural Religion, a part of the Moral and Eternal Law, are come already to talk of its being indifferent.* p. 172, 173.

Min. He abuſes my words and their apparent ſenſe: This I ſaid, *That our Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount, forbad nothing that is morally good, nothing that is either indifferent or expedient*, &c. My true meaning was, (and my words expreſs as much) that our Saviour is ſo far from forbidding any thing that is Moral, that he forbids nothing that is Indifferent or Expedient.

Par. Yet herein (he ſays) *you may ſee your ſelf at a loſs too, if you obſerve that our Saviour in the ſame Sermon forbad the uſe of a Trumpet in giving alms.* Ibid.

Min. Commend me to this for a ſpruce Notion indeed! *Chriſt here* (ſaith *Grotius*) *ſpeaks Metaphorically, and by this we are forbidden*

bidden to make proclamation when we beſtow our alms: So that it is not a Trumpet which Chriſt forbids, but vain-glory and oſtentation under that Metaphor: And if vain-glory and oſtentation be indifferent, I ſhall confeſs *T. E.*'s Argument to be good, otherwiſe a perfect fallacy.

Par. *But* (he ſays) *that in taking it for granted that an Oath is expedient, you again beg the Queſtion.* Ibid.

Min. Was not its expediency ſufficiently proved even by your Confeſſion? *That it had been made an Inſtrument of eſtabliſhing ſuch happy Leagues and bands of Amity, and that Contention and Striſe were ended by it?* If this be begging the queſtion, I know not what begging the queſtion is.

Fr. Conf. p. 68.

Par. However you ſaid *that Chriſt's words muſt be taken with a limitation, as not forbidding all but ſome Oaths only.* *T. E.* will allow of no ſuch limitation. *Ibid.*

Min. Why not a limitation in ſwearing as in other things? Chriſt in this Chapter forbids not all anger, *but anger without a cauſe*, *verſ.* 22. Not every looking on a Woman, but *looking on a Woman to luſt after her*, verſ. 28. Not all divorce, but divorce *for every cauſe*, verſ. 32. And ſo doubtleſs not all kind of ſwearing, as may be fully proved from the very Text which plainly contains theſe two exceptions.

Firſt, That we muſt not ſwear at all by the Creatures, for ſo the words run, *Swear not at all neither by heaven nor by earth*, &c. there's no

no full ſtop after [*ſwear not at all*] they are but half the ſentence, and the Quakers do unmannerly interrupt Chriſt here in the middle of his Speech, and will not hear him out, nor take his words together, the whole ſentence being, *Swear not at all by Heaven*, &c. Now what work may be made with any Scripture if we thus break it off in the middle? *Have I any power to ſay any thing*, ſaith *Balaam?* thus may we prove him dumb. *There are ſome ſtanding here, which ſhall not taſte of death*, ſaith Chriſt—ſtop there, and you may prove them immortal. Numb. 22. 38. Mat. 16. 28.

Beſides, if that part of the ſentence [*ſwear not at all*] be full ſenſe, and forbid all Oaths whatſoever, what need was there of adding any particular exceptions, ſeeing they were provided againſt in that one general? As if the Law ſhould ſay, *Thou ſhalt not kill any man at all*; What need were there to ſay, not a Merchant, not a Farmer, not a Judge, not a Prieſt, not a Quaker, *&c?* This would be a meer tautologie, of which I hope the Quaker will not accuſe our bleſſed Saviour. Wherefore many of the Ancients did expound this to a prohibition from ſwearing by Creatures, and particularly S^t. *Hierom* on the place, which I doubt will not pleaſe *T. E.* very well.

A ſecond limitation is taken from the next words, *But let your communication be yea yea, nay nay*; which is the Poſitive precept, as the former is the Negative, and is the remedy of the evil cuſtom of ſwearing in communication,

munication, which shews that our Lord is both forbidding and prescribing matters relating to our ordinary converse, it being strangely incoherent to say, *Swear not, no not in judgment*, &c. *but let your ordinary discourse be yea and nay.*

I shewed you before, that *Titus* 3. 2. [*speak evil of no man*] was as general a prohibition as this, yet could not bear a general interpretation; but this the Quaker passes by: however I will give you another like Text, in *Lev.* 18. 6. an *Israelite* there is commanded, *Not to approach to any that is near of kin to him.* Yet was that restrained to such degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity, as are afterwards mentioned, and to such as bear the same Analogy, as *Junius* and *Tremelius* note upon the place. Why then may not our Saviour's words be restrained to what follows after, according to that plain account which I have given you?

Confer. p. 74.

Par. But you said, that *Our Saviour is not here repealing the Law of* Moses, *but the false Glosses, which the Scribes and Pharisees had put upon it*: this he calls *a fond conceit*. p. 174.

Min. As *fond a conceit* as he takes it to be, I must tell him, that the famous S^t. *Augustine* was guilty of it, and so were most of the Learned Doctors of the Church.

Par. But I desire to be satisfied, whether any of *T. E*'s Authors were not guilty with you of this *fond conceit?*

Min. Yes, I do assure you, the famous *Origen*, whom himself cites *p.* 185. is of the same Opinion; and so likewise S^t. *Hierome* on

Orig. cont. Cels. l. 7.

on the place ſays no leſs; yea, and S^t. *Chryſoſtome* alſo affirms, that this ſwearing by Creatures, was a corruption brought in by the Phariſees, being abſolutely forbidden by the Law of *Moſes*, where he commands to ſwear only by the Name of God.

But then I muſt tell you, that *Beza* whom he ſo often quotes, is guilty of this *fond conceit.* * * *Omnino* πάντως, (i. e.) *per ullam rem Creatam, ut apparet ex proximè ſequentibus, quas Chriſtus damnat, formulis: Ex quibus liquet, indirectas jurandi ſpecies,* non ipſum jusjurandum legitimè conceptum, *reprehendi, ac proinde* universaltm particulam *à nonnullis temere hoc loco urgeri.* Beza Annot. in loc.

Now I would know why *T. E.* would uſe the Authority of ſuch men, that with me are guilty of ſo fond a conceit, as he fancies this to be? hereafter ſure he will be wiſer.

Par. But he thinks he can oppoſe all this from Biſhop *Gawden*, whom he calls an *Earthen Pitcher*, *He* (it ſeems) *ſaith, our Saviour gives many ſingular Leſſons or Precepts of more eminent Diligence, Patience, Charity, Mortification, Self-denial, Sincerity, Conſpicuity, Perſeverance and Perfection of Obedience required now under the Goſpel, above what either the letter of the Moſaical Law ſeemed to exact, or by the Phariſaical Interpretations were taught to the Jews.* p. 175.

Min. Methinks it does very ill become this Quaker, to call Biſhop *Gawden* by that contemptuous name of *Earthen Pitcher*. For (if I be not very much miſtaken) there's ſcarce one ſip of Learning with which he flouriſhes

riſhes this Chapter, which he has not drunk out of this *Pitcher*. The Jewiſh Doctors ſay, *If we drink out of a pit, we muſt not throw dirt into it afterwards*; which this Quaker hath done againſt all rules of gratitude and manners.

However let me tell you, that I ſee nothing in Biſhop *Gawden*'s Aſſertion which I cannot ſubſcribe to, yet hold to my own.

Par. He labours in this place to prove, that *Chriſt did forbid more than was forbidden by Moſes, even ſolemn ſwearing*; *therefore the Text is not to be reſtrained to the Phariſees Gloſſes*; *and ſo* (he ſaith) *he doth in other inſtances.* pag. 175, 176, &c.

Min. Becauſe he forbad more than *Moſes*, does it follow, that he contradicted *Moſes?* and then will he not contradict himſelf, when he ſaith, *He came not to deſtroy the Law?* v. 17.

But the queſtion is, whether ſuch a *Law be taken away?* the anſwer is, that *more is required by Chriſt than Moſes:* Is refining and elevating a Law, an aboliſhing and repealing of it?

The Ceremonial Law pointed at Chriſt, and decipher'd all his Offices, and the Evangelical purity, which upon the offering up of Chriſt, gave place to its antitype of its own accord, without any further need of an expreſs repeal.

But the Moral Law is improved and advanced; which having been obſcured by the Phariſees Gloſſes, and traditional Expoſitions, it was no *ſuperfluous* and *needleſs* thing (as *T. E.* ſuggeſts) for our bleſſed Saviour to clear and vindicate it.

Par.

Par. You ſaid enough before to make it very reaſonable, that Chriſt did not herein forbid *All* Oaths whatſoever. Yet *T. E.* ſpends two or three pages to prove from the particle [*But*] here in the Text, that our Saviour excludes *all manner of ſwearing*, p. 177, 178, 179.

Min. Not only the Particle [*But*,] but the whole Sentence is to be interpreted by what goes before and follows after. Had our Saviour ſaid [*But I ſay unto you ſwear not at all*,] and there ſtop't; And if [*Them*] in the Text be only applicable to *Moſes* (as *T. E.* would have it, *p.* 179. forgetting in the mean while his ſecond Chapter;) Then the Particle [*But*] had been of more force. But whereas our Saviour mentions ſwearing *by Creatures*, and *in Communication*, immediately after [*ſwear not at all*;] *T. E*'s arguing here from the Particle [*But*] is *idle* and *impertinent*; And 'tis plain, the Quakers interpretation of this Text (and *not* the Prieſts) *will render the words of our Saviour Chriſt ſuperfluous and vain.*

Par. Now let us examine *T. E*'s notes upon the words of St. *James*, *Chap.* 5. 12. [*But above all things my Brethren, ſwear not.*] Here he grants that *the Apoſtle did forbid only ſuch Oaths as our Saviour had forbidden*, p. 181.

Min. Having ſhewed you that our *Saviour* forbids not All Oaths whatſoever, this Text of St. *James* muſt needs fall ſhort of the Quaker's purpoſe. By the by, it will be worth your noting, that he writ to the Jews (who had been ſtrangely accuſtom'd to ſwear by the Creatures, and in their Communication) to

be the more careful and watchful over their words.

But I cannot but wonder that *T.E.* should say, that *Christ forbad Oaths* (which are *confessedly lawful during the Law*;) when himself has told us, that *the time when our Saviour lived was under the Law*, and that *in this state many things were indulged to the Jews*, p. 37, 38. If so; surely Christ in the time of the Law would not contradict the Law. And therefore if St. *James* (as *T.E.* acknowledges) forbad Oaths *no further* than Christ forbad them, this Sophister by his own distinction has quite spoiled his Argument.

Par. But I observe that *T.E.* stands much upon the first and last words of the Text [*But above all things, &c.*] And says, *That he might be sure to leave no Oath unforbidden, he closes up his Sentence with these comprehensive words, Neither by any other Oath*, p. 182.

Min. As to the first part [*But above all things,*] Let St. *Augustine* be the Expositor, *Why above all things?* (says he) *Is to swear, worse than to steal, or to commit Adultery*, &c? *—these are evil in themselves, so is not swearing* *, *Why then must we avoid Oaths above all? Not that they are worse than any other sin, but because we most easily slip into them, having gotten a Custom of them* †. So that these words [*above all*] strike at that *irreverence* towards the Majesty of God, which indeliberate swearing (as that in common talk) makes men continually liable unto. The Apostle then is speaking here of customary Oaths, *not* of solemn and judicial.

As

* This *T.E.* himself grants, p. 141, &c.

† Aug. in ver. Ap. Serm. 30.

As to the other Clauſe [*Nor by any other Oath,*] I ſaid enough in the *Conference* to prove it referred *to the Head, to Jeruſalem,* and other ſuch like Oaths, which Chriſt had particularly mention'd; But the Quaker has paſt over my Arguments, having had little or nothing to object againſt them. But I now add, that *in all Examples of a General Rule, the Greater inſtances ſhould be named particularly, and the Leſſer comprehended in a General Phraſe;* whereas if the Quaker's Expoſition be right, the *leſſer Oaths* [*by Creatures*] are named *particularly*, and the *Greater* [*by God's Name*, uſed in Judicatories] are at the moſt but *hinted at* under a General Phraſe of—— [*any other Oath*;] which is againſt the Rules of Speech, and very abſurd. [*Swear not by leſſer Oaths, by Heaven nor by Earth, nor by any other Oath,* i. e. *not by God's Name in Judgment*:] this is the Quaker's interpretation.

And indeed 'tis very odd, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles (if they intended to prohibit All ſwearing by God's Name) ſhould never give one plain word about it, when as they do mention Oaths by Creatures, which are not ſo material. To conclude, St. *James* muſt be limited to Communication as well as Chriſt, as is plain from the very words; And ſo St. *Auguſtine* and Antiquity did expound him, whoſe practice (being the next enquiry) will be an excellent Commentary on both theſe Scriptures; For if any of thoſe Primitive Fathers did *practiſe*, or *allow* ſolemn ſwearing, they did not ſurely think that it was forbidden by Chriſt, or by St. *James*.

Par. But before we come to enquire what thoughts the Ancient Fathers had of Oaths, I must know what you will answer to this objection, *If Men would use themselves to speak Truth, would not this be enough to give Credit to what they say in all Cases? If their yea be yea, and their nay nay, that is, if their Promise be Performance, and their words be Truth; will not this answer all ends in Humane Society? Then farewell all swearing?* p. 183, 184.

Min. Might not all this have been said against Oaths *before* and *in* the time of the Law? Might not *Abraham*'s Servant thus have answered his Master requiring an Oath of him, when he sent him to fetch a Wife for his Son * Gen. 24. *Isaac*? Might not he have said, *Have I been so long in thy Pious Family? Hast thou thought* † ver. 2. *Me worthy to rule over all that thou hast* †, *And now darest not trust me in this matter, without an Oath? Wilt thou make no distinction between the virtuous and the vitious, the True Man and the False, the sincere and Hypocrite, the Good and the Bad? Wilt Thou (who hast given us so* ‖ Gen. 18. 19. *many instructions* ‖ *to fidelity) enjoyn a sincere and upright Man to wear the Badge of Hypocrisie, an Oath?* Thus *Abraham*'s Servant might have argued with his Master at *T. E*'s rate, *p.* 126. But he was better instructed, than to make *this* a Plea for Disobedience. And do's not *T. E*'s way of arguing blasphemously charge God with folly, who not only used swearing himself, but in necessary Cases enjoyn'd it to be used by Men? Thus (to give you one instance) in *Exod.* 22. 10, 11. God enjoyns that

If

If a Man deliver unto his Neighbour an Aſs, or an Ox, or a Sheep, or any Beaſt to keep, and it dye or be hurt, or driven away, no Man ſeeing it; Then ſhall an OATH *of the Lord be between them both, that he hath not put his hand unto his Neighbours Goods; and the Owner of it ſhall accept thereof,* &c. Might not the Quaker *at his wild rate* have ſaid, *This was a needleſs injunction*; ſeeing that in the 20*th Chapter* a little before this, God had deliver'd the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, whereby he had ſufficiently provided againſt *All Lying, Hypocriſie,* &c? So that if we purſue *T.E*'s Argument to the end, it will charge not only the Holy Men of Old, but God himſelf (you ſee) with impertinency and folly. This however I will confeſs, that to ſpeak the Truth *is Security enough*, but then an Oath is ſtill neceſſary (in ſome Caſes) to aſſure us (as much as is poſſible) *that it is the Truth* they ſpeak; For we cannot ſee into Mens Hearts, and therefore hereby we provide againſt the worſt.

Par. Now let us hear whether Antiquity be of your ſide; For *T.E.* would have us believe the contrary: And accordingly tells us that *Polycarpus (who lived in the time of the Apoſtles) being required by the Magiſtrate to ſwear by the fortune of* Cæſar, *refuſed, giving this only Reaſon, I am a Chriſtian, and was therefore burned to death*, p.185.

Min. Polycarp refuſed not *ſimply to ſwear*, but to ſwear *by the Fortune of* Cæſar; And who goes about to juſtifie an Oath, taken by a Hea-

then Goddeſs, for ſuch was Fortune reputed among the *Romans* * ?

* Sed tenos facimus fortuna Deam, Cælóq; locamus. Juven. Sat. 10.

But upon what account the Oath *by the Fortune* or *Genius* of *Cæſar* was refuſed, as not conſiſtent with Chriſtianity, we learn from *Origen* (which will ſerve to anſwer what the Quaker ſays of him, *p.* 186.) *We ſwear not* (ſays he) *by the Fortune of the Emperor: For whether fortune be only what happens, we ſwear not by that which is not at all, as if it were God, leſt we ſhould place the power of an Oath upon ſuch things which ought not to be: Or whether the Genius or Dæmon of the Roman Emperor be that which is called his Fortune, even ſo we had rather dye than ſwear by a wicked and perfidious Devil* †. Hear alſo *Tertullian* as to this point? *But we alſo do take an Oath, but not by the Genii of the* Cæſars. And then goes on, *Do ye not know, that* Genii *are called Devils? Devils we are wont to Adjure, that we may drive them out of Men; not to ſwear by them, that we ſhould conferr on them the Honour of Divinity* ‖. One thing I wonder at, that the Quaker did not leave out [*by the fortune of* Cæſar.]

† Orig. cont. Gel. l. 8. Edit. Cant. p. 421.

‖ Terr. Apol. caſ. 32.

Par. That would not have been honeſt.

Mir. Yet I muſt tell you, that he has left out as conſiderable a paſſage in this ſtory. For *Euſebius*, in the Book and Chapter which the Quaker quotes, writes, *that the Proconſul urged and ſaid, Swear, and I will let thee go, blaſpheme and defie Chriſt* ‖. So that *Polycarp* was Burned to death, not *barely* for refuſing to take an Oath, but *ſuch an Oath*, as indeed was a *Renunciation* of Chriſtianity.

‖ Lib. 4. c. 15.

Par.

Par. If *T. E.* get no more by his other inſtances, than he has got by this of *Polycarp*, he had better have let them alone. However his next is of *Baſilides*. *Baſilides* (*a Roman Souldier*) *who led* Pontamiena *to execution, and by her conſtant Martyrdom was turned to Chriſt*) *being required to ſwear, refuſed it utterly*, &c. *for which he loſt his Head.* ibid.

Min. To this I anſwer that in all probability, the Oath tender'd to *Him*, was the very ſame that *Polycarp* and the Chriſtians in that Age refuſed to take; Whereupon the *Centuriators* tell us, that *He refuſed to ſwear* [*More Ethnico*] *in the Heathen manner, by the Pagan Gods* †. To make this appear more probable, let us conſider (*Firſt*) the ſenſe of the Church concerning an Oath, when *Baſilides* ſuffer'd; Which we may learn from *Tertullian* before-mention'd, who wrote his *Apology* in the time of the perſecution of *Severus*, in which perſecution *Pontamiena* ſuffer'd Martyrdom; and from *Origen*, by whom ſhe was inſtructed in the Principles of Chriſtianity; and from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who was Catechiſt in *Alexandria*, when *Baſilides* made his Profeſſion *there*, as is noted by *Euſebius* ||. Now *Clemens* ſpeaks ſharply againſt ſwearing in many places, as *Paed. lib.* 3. *c.* 11. *Strom. lib.* 5, &c. and deſcribing his [*Underſtanding Pious Chriſtian*] he ſaith, *He is no ſwearer in what he affirms or denies, but will add,* [*I ſpeak the truth*:] Yet he ſaith, Ἔυορκος μὲν, &c. *He that uſeth an OATH Piouſly, is not addicted to ſwear, and*

† Cent. Magdeburg. Cent. 3. c. 6.

|| Euſ. l. 6. c. 4, 5.

is rarely brought to the use of an Oath. Where 'tis plain, that in the opinion of *Clement*, a *pious Christian* may use an Oath, and that where he speaks *against swearing*, he means *irreverent, needless*, and *customary swearing*, or swearing *by the Heathen Gods.* (*Secondly*,) Let us consider what opinion *Eusebius* (the Relater of this passage) had himself of an Oath. And here I must needs say, that he speaks as largely against swearing as any other Ancient Writer; yet he declareth that wonderful Vision which appeared in the Heavens to *Constantine* the Great, to be of *undoubted certainty*, because *he himself heard it related by* Constantine, *who confirmed what he spoke by his OATH*† Whereby it appears that both *Eusebius*, and that Pious Emperor doubted not, but a weighty occasion would require and allow the solemn use of Oaths. Now is it likely, that *Eusebius* would *record Basilides a Martyr*, for obstinately refusing *that thing*, which *himself* counted lawful? But suppose the Case were as my Adversary relates it; yet *Basilides* being but a new Convert to Christianity, and consequently not well knowing in the Controversies therein; Of what validity is such an One's Authority?

† Euſ. de vit. Conſtant. lib. 1. cap. 22.

Par. You have made it appear already, what kind of Oaths *Origen* was chiefly against; yet *T. E.* will have him to be against All whatsoever; And brings him in saying, *that Christ did manifestly forbid to swear at All*, p. 186.

Min. Though the Quaker tells us not whence this passage is taken, yet we may note it

it is taken out of thoſe Homilies on St. *Matthew*, which bear *Origen*'s Name, but are much doubted of by *Eraſmus*; So that 'tis a Queſtion whether this be *Origen*, or ſome Impoſtor: But ſuppoſe it be *Origen*; He (*Firſt*) in thoſe undoubted Books againſt *Celſus*, maintains, *That God the Father did not by the Goſpel of Jeſus bring in Any Commands contrary to the Law of* Moſes *; And ſo he could not think, Chriſt prohibited ſolemn ſwearing contrary to *Moſes* (as *T. E.* affirms.) *Secondly*, 'Tis plain *Origen* meant, that Chriſt had forbid to ſwear *at all on ſlight occaſions*, becauſe he himſelf on a weighty occaſion do's ſwear: *God is Witneſs unto, or upon my Conſcience*, is his Oath; *contra Celſum lib.* 1. So that if ſuch expreſſions of the Fathers as *T. E.* quotes, be not taken with a limitation to ſome kind of Oaths in Communication, *&c.* we muſt unworthily fancy that they contradicted themſelves as well in *words* as in *deeds*.

* Orig. in Celſ. l. 7.

Par. Now he is come again to *Baſil* ſirnamed the Great, who ſaith, *In the Law the Lord ſeemeth to allow an Oath to a perfect man, which in the Goſpel is altogether forbidden*, &c. ibid.

Min. This Phraſe [*the Lord ſeemeth to allow an Oath in the Law*] do's plainly import, that an Oath was not *really* Lawful then: Now do's the Quaker imagine that St. *Baſil* did think an Oath was but *ſeemingly* allowable during the Law? This will render him more ignorant than the Quakers are themſelves, who confeſs an Oath *really* allowable *then*. So that if

if we make ſenſe of St. *Baſil*'s words, His meaning muſt needs be this; *Oaths in Converſe are* ſeemingly *allowed by the Law (though not really ſo;) In the Goſpel they are* not ſeemingly, *but* plainly *forbidden.* And that *Baſil* meant Oaths in Communication, we may be ſure from thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Canons he made: Of which the 10*th* Canon is, *That He who had ſworn with due Circumſtances, ſhould not be forced to retract his Oath.* And the 29*th* Canon ſaith, *They who uſe to ſwear they will do evil things, ought to be cured by all means, by teaching them* (Firſt) *Not to ſwear Lightly,* (Secondly,) *Not to perſiſt in their evil purpoſes*: Whence the famous *Balſamon* in his Notes on theſe Canons concludes, that St. *Baſil was not againſt lawful Oaths* †.

† Beveregius Pandect. Tom. 2. Canon. S. Baſilii ad Amphiloc.

Par. Next he brings in his other *Authentick Witneſs Gregory Nazianzen*, Who in his *Dialogue* (framed between *A.* and *B.*) *againſt ſwearing*, diſcourſes thus. B. *What if I uſe an Oath unwillingly, but to free me from danger?* A. *Let another allow thee that.* B. *What if we be drawn by Neceſſity to give an Oath?* A. *Why didſt thou not rather dye? for ſurely thou ſhouldſt rather dye than do it. And that he ſpeaketh here of All Oaths, even the moſt ſolemn,* T. E. bids us *obſerve what he ſayth a little before.* B. *But what wilt thou ſay to me of the Old Covenant? ſurely it doth not prohibit an Oath, but requires a true one.* A. *No wonder, at that time only it was preſcribed in the Law concerning Murder; but now it is not Lawful, for any Cauſe, ſo much as to ſmite or beat, &c.* p. 186, 187.

187. This is so considerable a passage, that not only *T.E.* but *thirteen* of the Grand Quakers (in the Book before-mention'd call'd a *Treatise of Oaths*) do mention it as a great Argument, *p. 64.* to shew *that the Practice of Antiquity is clearly against you.*

Min. You may observe here, that *T.E.* do's falslly and dishonestly again Call this Tract of *Nazianzen*'s a *Dialogue against swearing*, when the Title is, *A Dialogue against Common swearers*; And a little after, where *Nazianzen* saith, καὶ γὰρ φονεύειν τῶν ἐκεῖνον τῶν ἔννομον, Νῦν δ' οὐδὲ παίειν· *i. e. Then it was forbidden to murder, but now even to strike*; *T.E.* to make *Gregory* speak like a Quaker, turns the last words, *but now it is not lawful, for any Cause, so much as to smite or beat.* Where he puts in one half of the Sentence out of his own head; and it would make one think (who saw not the Cheat) that *Nazianzen* thought it unlawful for a *Father* or *School-master* to whip a Child for his faults, or for a *Magistrate* to punish a Malefactor by stripes. —— But to come to the Matter; I will make it appear that *Gregory Nazianzen* believed the Lawfulness of Oaths upon weighty occasions (*First*) From his own words in this very Dialogue against Common Swearers. And (*Secondly*) from his own Practice.

In his Dialogue He hath these words. *Forbear to multiply Oaths, especially commonly, and great Oaths, and on every occasion*: —— And a little after, *Swear not to all things, nor always, that is, Playing, Eating, when thou art*

art croſſed, or when thou art bleſſed —— &c. B. *When then, and on what occaſion do you allow us to Swear?* A. *When there is a neceſſity.* B. *Very well! But when will you call it a neceſſity? when I may free a good man?* A. *Yes.* B. *Or when I may deliver my ſelf from a baſe aſperſion?* A. *And then it is lawful.*

Opera Greg. Naz. Vol. 2. Iamb. 20. p. 224. Edit. Paris.

Par. I ſee already that Gregory (that *Authentick Witneſs*, as *T. E.* calls him) is againſt the *Quakers*, and not againſt *You* in this matter; and yet what the Quakers cite out of him relates to *falſe* and *unlawful* Oaths to free our ſelves from danger, which the Holy Father will not allow, nor *You* (I believe) neither. It ſeems he poſitively declares Swearing in caſes of neceſſity to be lawful; But can you prove that he ever ſwore himſelf?

Min. That may eaſily be proved from one of his own Poems, which is Entituled [Ὅρκοι ἢ Ἐπαγγελίαι δὲ Ὅρκου, *i.e.* OATHS or PROMISES BY OATH, †] wherein he ſolemnly *Swears by by his Saviour* to avoid ſuch and ſuch Sins, and to perform ſuch and ſuch Duties of Chriſtianity. The Poem begins thus.

† Ibid. Carmen 17. p. 92.

Ὄμοσα τὸν Λόγον αὐτὸν, ὅ μοι Θεὸς ἐστι μέγιστος,
Ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀρχὴ, &c.

et. Joh. 1. 1.

I've Sworn by th' *Word*, who is my God moſt Great,
The *Beginning* from th' *Beginning*, &c.

And a little after,

Ὄμοσα,

Ὤμοσα, μήπε νόῳ γε νόον μέγαν ἐχθρὰ νοῆσαι
Ῥιφῆναι, &c.

I've Sworn that I will never entertain
Diſhonourable thoughts of God, &c.

Then the Holy Man goes on.

Εἰ Τριάδ' Θεότητα διατμήξαιμι φαεινῆς,
Ἐσσόμενσ καιρῶν νεύμασιν ἀντιπάλων.

IF I, complying with bad times, Deny
The *Unity* of th' Glorious *Trinity*.

Here you may obſerve he follows the Hebrew *form of Swearing*, as he do's all along, till he comes almoſt to the end of his Poem; The Particle [Εἰ, *i.e. If*] being uſed by him above twelve times; And after all comes the EXECRATION (whereby *T. E.* may learn that *his Authentick Witneſs* did not think that *This makes an Oath more unſuitable to the Nature of the Goſpel.* p. 169.)

Ἄλλῳ Χριστὸς ἔοι πλέον ἴλαος· αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο
Τὴς ἄχρις ἡ πολιῆς αὖρα φέροι καμάτυς.

Let Others *then* Chriſt's Mercy ſoon obtain;
But let *My* Labours fruitleſs be and vain.

I told you before that, an Oath may lawfully be uſed in the *Dedicating our ſelves to God*; here you ſee Gregory uſeth it to that purpoſe, as it were

were crying out to all (says *Billius* ‖) *that of the Apostle*, * *Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ. For I have SWORN* (*that* I *may speak in the words of the Psalmist* †) *and am stedfastly purposed to keep the Righteous Judgments of Christ.* Now what do yon think of the Quaker and his friends? You see *Nazianzen* is point-blank *Contrary* to their pretences.

‖ *Billius* Annot. on the Poem.
* 1 Cor. 11. 1.
† *Psal.* 119. 106.

Par. I cannot tell what to think; *Well* may the poor ignorant people be deluded by them, little imagining there can be so much Deceit under such serious pretences & demure Countenances: But if this be their way of managing their Cause; and their Principles be such, as are not to be defended but by such wofull tricks as these; *Then farewell Quakerism,*

Min: What I have said of *Gregory Nazianzen* may serve also to clear St. *Basil* further in this point; for *such* was the intimacy and correspondence between these two, that *Gregory* tells us in the funeral Oration he made for St. *Basil, that they were but as one Soul in two Bodies.* ‖ Now if St. *Basil* did so concur in all things with *Nazianzen*, is it possible, that the one should differ from the other in a *Point*, which (in the opinion of *Hubberthorn*) *is no less than Antichristianism?*

‖ Naz. Orat. 32.

Par. I see his Quotations thus far have done his Cause more hurt than good: But what do you say to the testimony of *Epiphanius, that we must not Swear, no, not by the Lord himself, nor by any other Oath, for it is an evil thing to Swear at all*, p. 188?

Min.

Min. The Quaker (and thoſe other Thirteen, from whom he has this paſſage) did very cunningly in not mentioning the Occaſion of that diſcourſe, which would have ſpoil'd the Argument. *Epiphanius* is writing againſt one *Elxai* a Judaizing *Heretick*, who commanded his followers to Swear by Creatures, (*viz.*) *Salt*, *Water*, *Earth*, *Bread*, &c. Now *Epiphanius* ſaith: *This Heretick is condemned by the Law and the Goſpel both, ſince the Lord ſaith both in the Law and in the Goſpel, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods but Me, & thou ſhalt not ſwear by any other Name*, and *Swear not neither by Heaven, nor by Earth, nor any other Oath, but let your Communication be yea yea, nay nay, for what is more than this is of the Evil one: And I ſuppoſe the Lord ſpoke of this before, (becauſe there were like to be ſome who would ſay, we might Swear by other names) firſt, that we might not Swear neither by the Lord himſelf (that is in Communication) nor ſecondly, by any other Oath* (on any occaſion whatſoever) *for it is* (not as *T. E.* tranſlates it, *an evil thing to Swear at all, but*) *of the evil one to ſwear.* Theſe are the words, and this the ſenſe of *Epiphanius*, and if you will compare them with *T. E*'s Citation, you will ſee how he alters the words, and adds as he ſees occaſion: But when all is done, the occaſion being to confute an *Heretick* ſwearing by Creatures, and the words of *Epiphanius* no more than the words of Scripture, which we have proved muſt be taken with Limitation, it follows they are nothing to *T. E*'s purpoſe.

Par.

Par. Chryſoſtom is again produced by him, who ſays: *It is not lawful to Swear, neither in a juſt, nor unjuſt thing*, &c. ibid.

Min. The places, which *T. E.* cites, are out of thoſe popular Diſcourſes that bear St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name, but are ſuſpected to be none of his by very learned men; yet ſuppoſe they were genuine, you have had already a ſufficient anſwer given you to all *T. E*'s pretences from hence.* I ſhall now further add, that St. *Chryſoſtom*'s diſcourſe being directed to private perſons, muſt therefore be limited to private unneceſſary Oaths, for had his diſcourſe been againſt the Oaths uſed in the Imperial Courts, The Emperour doubtleſs would have called him to an account for his Doctrine, which he was ſo far from doing, that he advanced him to the See of *Conſtantinople*.

* See p. 189.

But we may more clearly perceive his meaning by comparing all paſſages together. He tels us, *how exceeding cuſtomary the Sin of Swearing was in his time; that the people uſed to take the Goſpel to Swear by, & to put one another to Swear at the Holy Altar*; and declares, *that the like exceſs of Swearing was not to be found in any other City, as in that of Antioch, where he then lived*:* And therefore for the beating down this profane and irreligious practice, he ſpeaks ſo zealouſly and vehemently againſt Swearing, and expreſſes himſelf in ſuch large and general terms, that they who do not weigh one paſſage with another, may think that Oaths were *univerſally* diſallowed by him: But to put it out of all diſpute, that this was not the ſenſe of that

* Ad pop. Antioc. Hom. 5. & 16. Hom. de juram.

that Father, we find him of an Opinion, *that it was the Son of God who Swore by himself to Abraham*: ‖ And that he made use of the same Oath in the Gospel, when he said, *Amen Amen*; and expounding the words * of the Apostle, he saith: *By an Oath is determined the dispute of all matters of Contention*, and *that not of this, or of that, but of All.*

‖ Hom. 11. ad Heb.

* Heb. 6. 16.

Rev. 3. 14.

Par. Did our Saviour swear, when he said *Amen Amen*, or *Verily Verily*? If He did, whom did he swear by?

Min. He swore by himself. However, whether it be *really* so or no, yet it was *so* in the opinion of St. *Chrysostom* (as I have told you) and of several other Fathers, which shews that they were far from thinking All Oaths forbidden by Christ, while they held *He allowed them by his own Example.*

And indeed what can be more plain, than that our Saviour swore in Judgment as much as any Persons among the Jews in his time were wont to do? For in their Courts the Parties did not speak the words of the Oath, but the Magistrate did Adjure them by the Living God to *tell truly*; And then the answer they made to this adjuring, was accounted an *Answer upon Oath*, and they were reputed to have sworn, and to be obliged by the name of the Living God to speak the Truth. Now the High-Priest according to this Custome, saith to our Saviour *Mat* 26. 63. *I adjure thee* * [or (as in some translations) *I cause thee to swear*] *by the Living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God.* Our Lord being

* Ἐξορκίζω σε

thus Adjured or taken ſworn, Anſwers *ver.* 64. *Thou haſt ſaid*, or (as St. *Mark* more plainly *Chap.* 14. 62.) *I am* &c. Which Confeſſion he made according to the Rules of Court then; and accordingly they proceed to ſentence him for blaſphemy, as they impiouſly accounted this his Teſtimony concerning himſelf. * And if the Quakers themſelves were to Swear in *Our Courts*, they ſhall never be required to Name the Name of God; for the Magiſtrate (or his ſubſtitute) names the Oath, and the Parties Sworn ſtand ſilent, only ſhewing their Conſent by Kiſſing the Book; Yet the Anſwer they make to ſuch Queſtions as the Judge then puts to them, are Called their Oaths, and they ſaid to Swear the things. Now ſure Chriſt would have *Reproved* the High-Prieſt for Adjuring Him, and giving Him an Oath, rather than have *Anſwered*, if it had been Unlawful; And I hope *T. E.* and his Brethren will Venter to do what our Bleſsed Lord hath done before them; nor will they think, *He* broke *his own* Laws.

* See *Grotius* on Mat. 26. 63.

Par. Now *T. E.* crowds in a company of Quotations together, as that of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Chriſtians ought not to Swear at all*; Then *Chryſoſtoms* and *Origens* ſayings againſt Oaths (but of theſe two you have given me a ſatisfactory account before;) Next that of *Lactantius*: *A Good man will not ſwear falſly, leſt he mock God; nay he will not ſo much as ſwear at all, leſt at one time or other he fall, even by Cuſtome into Perjury.* Laſt of all *That* of *Hierom*, *The truth of the Goſpel doth not admit an Oath.* p. 190. *Min.*

Min. As for *Juſtin Martyr*, His words are falſly cited by *T. E.* for he is ſpeaking of Chriſt's Laws and faith: *Concerning not ſwearing at all, and always ſpeaking truth, he thus commands, Swear not at all* &c. This is not what the Quaker alledges, *That Chriſtians ought not to ſwear at all*; nor doth it ſound to *T. E*'s ſence, but relates to ſpeaking truth in Communication without an Oath; Yea in the ſame Apology, he ſaith: *The Chriſtians need not die for Chriſt, if they would diſſemble, for we might (ſays he) do that which the Proverb ſaith, I ſwear with my Tongue, but my Heart was not made to Swear*: So that it ſeems Chriſtianity would allow them to *Swear*, but not to *Equivocate* in Swearing.

As for *Lactantius*, His words do plainly relate to common and Cuſtomary Swearing, as appears by that Reaſon he gives, *viz.*—— *leſt at one time or other he fall, even by Cuſtom, into perjury.*

Laſtly, that of *Hieroms* muſt be meant of *ſlight Oaths* or *Oaths by Creatures*; for St. *Hierom* himſelf ſwears on Great Occaſion, *God is my Witneſs to my Conſcience*: * And He relates, that *he being in a Viſion was dragged to Chriſts Tribunal, and ſcourged for too much delight in* Tully; *nor* (ſaith he) *was I diſmiſſed, till I promiſed upon* OATH *to amend* †. And to ſhew that he was wholly Contrary to *T. E.* and his Brethren, He plainly ſaith, *Conſider that our Saviour hath not here forbidden to Swear by God, but by Heaven, by Earth, by Jeruſalem, and by thy Head.* *

* Ad Paulin. Ep. 153. et Ad Euſtoch. Epiſt. 22.

† Ad Euſtoch. Ep. 22.

* Comment. in Mat. 5.

Par. From the Ancients *T. E.* comes down to Bishop *Taylor*, who says, *Our Blessed Lord would not have his Disciples to swear at all (not in publick Judicature) if the Necessity of the world would permit him to be obeyed. If Christians will live according to the Religion, the word of a Christian were a sufficient Instrument to give Testimony*, &c. p. 191.

Min. As for this Citation, you see the Doctor himself here confesses, the *Necessities of the world* will not permit the precept to be obeyed in that *sense*. Should I say, It were a happy thing, if men were never *cold*, *hungry*, or *sick*; for then there would be no need of *fire*, *food*, and *physick*: Will *T. E.* bring this saying of mine to prove, *That I am* (as cases stand) *against the use of these*? Yet thus he abuses the good Bishop; who *Took* divers Oaths himself, and *Required* them from others by Virtue of his office. And in his Exposition of the Third Commandment, The Second duty is *To invocate Gods Name directly, or by consequence in all solemn Adjurations, and publick Oaths.* ‖

‖ Holy Dying Chap. 4. §. 8. p. 164.

By this time, I hope, I have satisfied you, that *to Refuse All manner of Swearing* is a New Doctrine, and contrary to the Primitive Christian Faith; Yet to confirm this Truth, I shall give *T. E.* a few more undeniable Evidences in this matter.

Clemens of *Alexandria*, who (was Elder than any of *T. E*'s pretended Authorities, and) lived *Anno Christi* 192, saith clearly, *A Christian ought not to Swear to his affirmations, but*

to

to profeſs he ſpeaks Truth, and to live So that he may be believed ——— but there where Judgment requires it, He doth Rightly Swear to the Truth *. Which is more direct to our purpoſe than all the Quakers put together are to his. * Stromat. l. 7.

To him add the old Author of the *Apoſtolick Conſtitutions* (which ſome ſay, was this *Clemens*) *It is ſaid, Swear not at all; but if you ſhall ſwear, take heed it be a juſt Oath* †. † Lib. 7. c. 4.

Tertullian follows, who ſhewing why the Chriſtians would not Swear *by the Emperours Genius* adds ——— *But* WE DO SWEAR *(though not by the Genius of the Emperours, yet) by their Safety* (he means, *by God* the Author of their ſafety) *which is more excellent than all the Genii in the World* ‖. The *Practice* of *Origen* and *Hierom* you have had before. ‖ Apolog. Cap. 32.

St. *Athanaſius* ſaith, *Chriſt forbid to ſwear at all* *; yet that he did not thereby mean to exclude *ſolemn* and *neceſſary* Oaths, we may learn from his *Apology* to the Emperour *Conſtantius* (to whom the *Arrians* had falſly accuſed him;) where he often clears himſelf by Oaths, ſaying *God is Witneſs, and Chriſt is Witneſs*; & in another place, *We ſpeak this before God, for WE* CHRISTIANS *have this Oath*; where he plainly calls that an *Oath*, and an Oath *uſed by Chriſtians*. * Athan. in Paſſion. et Crucem Dom.

St. *Ambroſe* allows an Oath, *where we can be certain of the truth of what we ſwear* †. Let T. E. ſee his Comment on *Heb.* 6. where he tells us, that *Chriſt ſwore in the Goſpel, when he ſaid Amen Amen*, [or *verily verily*] *I ſay un-* † In Pſal. 118. Serm. 14.

to you. And upon the 16 *verse* he has these words, *If we must believe for the future the Oaths of Men, of whom the Prophet saith, All Men are Lyars, How much more ought we to believe the Oath of God, who is Truth, and can neither be deceived nor deceive?* T.E. may now abuse this Holy Man, and say, *I do not believe all Men are Lyars, whatever He may be; and I would gladly hear in what sense he will own himself to be a Lyar. This Man has been over hasty* [with David,] *and has catcht up the word at a venture; let us see whether he (who is so much for Confession) will as fairly confess his Error*, p. 124, 125. I am sure these impertinent words of *T. E*'s might as *justly* have been said against this Ancient Father as against Me. ——But to let this pass;

The third General Council of *Ephesus* imposed an Oath upon *Nestorius* and *Victor*; And so (saith *T.E. p.* 165.) did the 4*th* General Council upon some body, whose Name was *Basil.* And are not *all* these Fathers, and *two* General Councils, Competent Witnesses of the practice of the Primitive Church, and their sense of our Saviours words?

But further, it is attested by *Dio in the Life of* Antonius, and appears from *Tertullian*, that the Christians did *Take an Oath*, when they were Listed Souldiers under the Heathen Emperors; And their form of swearing was *By the Safety of* Cæsar, *&c.* And this was in the best and earliest days of Christianity; but afterwards when the Emperours became Christian, the Souldiers Oath was enlarged, but never

never taken away; For *Vegetius* records the form which the Chriſtian Souldiers uſed to take to Chriſtian Emperours. *They ſwear by God, by Chriſt, and by the Holy Ghoſt* †, &c. And what Chriſtians ever ſcrupled this? Who ever reproved the Emperors for *requiring* or the Souldiers for *taking* this Oath? And not only in the *Camp*, but alſo all proceedings in *Judicature* were managed by the uſe of Oaths, as I could prove at large, if it were not too tedious, or in the leaſt doubted by Men of Learning and Underſtanding. Veget. inſtit. rei militar.

Thus I hope you ſee with what ſophiſtry *T.E.* has managed what he produces as Arguments, and with how great diſingenuity he hath Cited his Authors, who are ſo far from being of his opinion in this Point, that they are evidently againſt him, and (to uſe his own Phraſe, *p.* 175.) *have laid* him *flat*. Now therefore let us paſs to his next Chapter.

CHAP. VII.

Of Taking Texts, &c.

Par. CConcerning the Question of taking Texts, it's marvellous to Me, that it ſhould become a Queſtion, ſeeing there is no appearance of *Reaſon* to doubt either its *Lawfulneſs* or *Expediency*.

Min. As little as there is; and though at our firſt Conference this was but an Occational Tranſition; yet *T. E.* thinks it of ſuch moment, as to make it the main Subject (you ſee) of a whole Chapter. And indeed if the queſtion be ſtated, we ſhall find very little work upon this Subject.

Par. Pray then do you ſtate the Caſe.

Min. To take a Text then, and to compoſe a Sermon thereon, is to pitch upon ſome portion of Scripture, to expound the ſame, and from thence to raiſe ſuch obſervations, and remarks, as (in the Preacher's judgment) tend moſt to the inſtruction and edification of the people.

So that the Queſtion will be this; Whether thus to pitch upon a portion of Scripture, to explain and to recommend the knowledge and practice thereof to the people, be diſpleaſing to the Majeſty of Heaven? If it be, Then are the Quakers in the right, and we truly are faulty: But if it be not (there being the Breach of no Law to make it a ſin;) Then you and others

others may take notice, that it's not God's Cauſe and Quarrel, that this Quaker is defending, but the contradicting and turbulent Spirit of his own Party.

Par. You told me, that St. *Peter* in *Acts* 2. and St. *Paul* in *Acts* 13. *took Texts, &c.* To this *T.E.* replies, that *if you and your Brethren have no better warrant for ſingling out a Text, and compoſing your Sermons out of it, than theſe Scriptures afford, your practice will appear to be very weakly grounded,* p. 196, 197.

Min. The Quaker (I perceive) oppoſes the Lawfulneſs of taking a Text, *&c.* becauſe not warranted by an expreſs Command from Scripture; which has been the ſottiſh miſtake of theſe later Ages, as if Nothing ought to be done without a Scripture-command; Theſe Men would do well to explain their great Principle, what they mean by *Scripture-warrant*, and to anſwer the Learned Diſcourſes of Mr. *Hooker* upon this Subject, which none of our Sectaries hitherto have been ſo hardy as to undertake.

As to the preſent practice of Preaching upon Texts, I have ſhewed the expediency of it already, produced Scripture Examples (and could produce more, if there were occaſion;) And now I ſhall produce Church Preſidents; Though indeed none of theſe are neceſſary in a Matter left to the Conduct of Prudence; and (I hope) you remember that the main of my Anſwer to this Scruple was this, *that the Apoſtles and We act under different Circumſtances, they might ſometimes ſpeak by the ſole Authority*

Fr. Conf. p. 86. *rity of infallible inſpiration; We take Texts to ſhew that we have no other doctrine to deliver, but what is taken out of the written word of God, &c.* this was the chief thing he ſhould have replied to; yet he do's by this, as by the weightieſt Paſſages in the *Conference*, Anſwers it by ſilence.

Par. Pray produce your Church Preſidents.

Min. I ſhall inſtance in *Baſil* the Great; He took Texts and Preached upon them, as may be ſeen in thoſe Homilies on the 15*th Pſalm*, quoted by this Quaker againſt me. The ſame practice appears by the more Ancient Homilies of *Origen* (another of his Authors) on *Leviticus*, *Numbers* and St. *Matthew*; And moſt plainly by St. *Auguſtine* in his Sermons *on the words of our Lord and the Apoſtle*; where that Holy Father ſingles out a *verſe* or two, out of the *Epiſtle* or *Goſpel* appointed for that Sunday, and Preaches on them. And if *T. E.* pleaſe to read his 30*th* Sermon †, he will find that he takes for his Text the words of St. *James*, *Above all things, my Brethren ſwear not*. Where he may learn (beſides *That* Texts were uſed in thoſe early times) how different his judgment is from the Primitive Fathers, in the point of ſwearing, *&c.* Since St. *Auguſtin*'s time, Examples are infinite for the taking of Texts, though not preſcribed by any *Canon* of the Church; For though All of us pitch upon a Subject, yet do we not always name a Text, as appears by the Church Homilies, which are ſo many orderly Diſcourſes upon certain Points.

† De verb. Apoſt.

Par.

Par. As for your instance of our Saviour's Preaching on a Text, *Luk.* 14. 17. He denies not the *Fact*, but says, *it was in the time of the Law, and suitable to that Ministration*, p. 200.

Min. By this shuffle, he will make all the examples, which our Saviour set before us in his Holy Life, to be no presidents for our imitation; Or as if it were Lawful to expound Texts of Scripture under the Law, but not under the Gospel; Or as if to expound Texts under the Law, were peculiar to that Ministration.

Par. But *T.E.* has another charge against the Priests, that *they take Texts to get Money by*, &c. p. 204.

Min. A virtuous Man may Marry a Woman with a good Portion, and yet be farr from making Money the End of his Marriage: But I shall pass by this, for the same reason I did before, when I met with it in *Hubberthorn*, *Because it is Railing, not Arguing.*

I shall only now desire you, and all sober Men to judge, whether a Methodical, orderly and regular Discourse, be not more profitable for the people, than a loose rambling overall points without any method, coherence, or visible scope, according to the wild practice of the Quakers.

This may suffice to vindicate our Taking Texts, since it was practised by *Christ* and His *Apostles*, Used by the Primitive *Fathers*, and is the Custom of this *Church*, being also found to be the safest way to prevent wandering from the

the Scripture Rule, the eaſieſt to be underſtood and remembred, and the way now uſed throughout all Chriſtendom, except in the Quakers Confuſed Aſſemblies; Where there is No Order, and therefore 'tis no wonder that Their Preachments are immethodical, roving, and as hard to be *Underſtood*, as they are to be *remembred*.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Humane Learning, Divine Inſpiration and Revelation.

Par. IN the beginning of *T.E*'s Diſcourſe of *Humane Learning*, He mainly inſiſts on theſe three things. *Firſt*, he brings a Charge againſt You in making *it* Neceſſary to the interpreting of Scripture. *Secondly*, Whereas you charged *Hubberthorn* for ſaying, *Peter was unlearned, when he opened the Scriptures*; *T. E.* tells us, that *the Scripture ſays it expreſly*, Acts 4. 13. And *(Thirdly)* to your Query, *Whether there was not difference between* Peter *the Fiſher-man, and* Peter *the Diſciple?* He ſaith, *there was, When He was a Fiſher-man, he was carnally minded; but afterwards, being a Diſciple, he became ſpiritually minded, &c.* p. 205, 206.

Min.

Min. To these I shall give a distinct Answer, and in as few words as the matter will bear. And I must tell you that *T. E.* hath here egregiously falsified *my words*, falsified the *Scripture*, and abused both St. *Peter* and *himself.*

First, I say he hath falsified my words in saying, *I make Humane Learning necessary*, &c. [*Humane*] is a word of his own shuffling in, and never so much as named in the page he quotes, nor in all my Discourse to you upon that Subject. I know that St. *Peter* was a true Interpreter of Scripture; and that he had not his Learning by Humane means, but by inspiration.

Secondly, He hath falsified the Scripture in affirming, that *it says expressly*, that *St. Peter was unlearned, &c.* Which is an *express* untruth. For he may as well say, that the Scriptures expressly say, that our Saviour was a *Wine-bibber*, &c. Indeed the Scripture tells us in the place he quotes, that the High-priest and others *perceived that* Peter *and* John *were unlearned and ignorant Men*, &c. But was all *Gospel* which *They* either said or perceived? Were all the perceptions and opinions of the Jewish Council *express* Truths? This is to make the Scripture own whatsoever it relates of wicked and mistaken Men.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, T.E. has abuſed St. *Peter* in ſaying, *He was carnally minded*; This being a calumny which He cannot prove; For doubtleſs St. *Peter* was a Good Man, when he was a Fiſherman.

Par. But methinks his greateſt overſight is this; that He having endeavour'd from *Acts* 4. to prove St. *Peter* and St. *John* two *expreſs* Ignoramus's, he ſhould ſo ſoon contradict himſelf, and tell us, that our Saviour before his Aſcenſion *opened their Underſtandings (which was an immediate and inward Operation of his Spirit and Power upon them) that they might underſtand the Scriptures.* p. 207.

Luk. 24. 45.

Min. You may ſee, what ſhifts an ill Cauſe brings a Man into. It ſeems he opened their Underſtandings *before his Aſcenſion*, and yet they were *unlearned and ignorant after* his Aſcenſion, as if they had *Loſt* and not Gain'd by it.

And he is not too in his Notion of the opening of their underſtandings, which he calls *an immediate operation of his Spirit and Power*: For that it was not; Our Saviour opened their Underſtandings by his convincing Arguments, *thus it is written, and thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer, ver.* 46. And if Chriſt had *then* inſpired them with that immediate and inward Operation of his Spirit and Power; How comes he in the 49*th verſe* to command them *to tarry in the City of* Jeruſalem *till they were endued with Power from on high*; intimating that as yet they had not received it?

Par.

Par. After a great many repetitions of the word [*Humane*] which was never put in by you; He brings a heavy Charge against you, *That you make Humane Learning all in all*; and *Not a word of the Spirit of God*, p. 211.

Min. This is a notorious Calumny: and if it were as he says; Why do's he so often cite the 103. *page* of the *Conference*, where I say, *The Spirit helpeth us to understand old Truths already Revealed in Scripture*; and that *We pray for his Assistance therein?* Indeed I did not so often mention the *Spirit* in that Discourse, because it was not the Matter of our debate, being denyed by neither side; But *Learning* is that which the Quakers deny, and that which I am now defending; And to oblige the Quaker, I will now put in the word [*Humane*,] since *Tongues are ceased*; Which yet is farr from excluding the Spirit of God; Should I say, that *Plowing* and *Sowing* are necessary to procure Corn, I do not thereby deny *God's Blessing* to be necessary; For indeed *Both* are necessary, *They* as natural means, *This* as a Divine efficacy to make them prosper. Even so, I say, humane Learning is necessary in these Ages for the *right interpreting of Scripture*; But then this Assertion is far from denying the Assistance of the Spirit, *which sanctifies our Learning*. So that this is a malicious conclusion he draws from my words.

Par. But he thinks that you have contradicted your self in asserting *the necessity of Learning to the interpreting of Scriptures* (*i. e.* the *hard*

hard places in the Scriptures, for your preceding words shew *that* to be your meaning;) When as you afterwards affirm, That the *necessary points of Religion are not hard to be understood*, And he is so pleas'd with this, that for fear the Reader should not take notice of it, he repeats it over and over, as *p.*212,215,234, 268.

Min: I find He is so tickled with this invention, that when he has nothing to say, He fills up his pages with a repetition of this seeming Contradiction.

But I must tell the Quaker, that he deals here most injuriously with me; For these two places of mine, were not spoken upon one and the same occasion, nor do they belong to the same Subject; For in the *90th page* of my Book, I am speaking of *Preaching* and *Interpreting* Scripture to others; In *p.*92. I am discoursing of private Christians understanding *so much* of Scripture, *as* is necessary to their own Salvation: which they may attain without humane *Learning*, otherwise none but the *Learned* can be saved. Now the Quaker disingenuously wrests all my Discourse to Preaching, *p.* 213, 214.

But let us see what consequence there is in his Arguments; an Unlearned Man may know what is necessary to his own Salvation, *therefore* He may be a Preacher unto others. Rare arguing! Is every Man, that can write his own hand-writing, fit to be a Writing-master? Or every Souldier, that can handle his Arms, fit to be a General? Or every Clown, that can draw

a

a Bill or Bond, fit to be a Counſellor or a Judge? A little knowledge with an honeſt Heart and good Life may do a Mans own buſineſs; but ſurely it requires more to be an interpreter of Scripture, to Preach, to defend the Faith againſt Hereticks, to inſtruct, exhort, comfort and and reprove in due ſeaſon. Methinks *T.E.* might have been more ingenuous, than to ſport himſelf with his own impoſtures, and ſo falſly to repreſent the paſſages of my Book, having done by it, as *Dionyſius* did by *Apollo*'s Statue, Whoſe *Silver Mantle* he took off, and then clad it with his own *Courſe Cloth*, and when he had ſo done, laughed it to ſcorn.

Par. I obſerve that *T. E.* goes on at this rate, picking up three paſſages ſpoken on different occaſions, to raiſe this obſervation, that *Learning is only neceſſary to the underſtanding of thoſe things which are leaſt neceſſary*, p. 215.

Min. Suppoſe it did follow from my words, that it is a Miniſter's Duty to Apply things that are plain, and make them more plain; this is no inconſiderable employment. St. *Peter* thought it his duty to be a Monitor, and to put the Churches *in remembrance* of things they *knew*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 12. And it requires Skill and Learning to manage even the plaineſt things to the beſt advantage of the people.

And though I ſaid the *Difficult places of Scripture were leaſt neceſſary*, I did not ſay *they were unneceſſary* (which would have been blaſphemy to aſſert;) For there is not *that*

Place, but the understanding of it may be *useful*, nay *necessary* too, when such as *T.E.* pervert them, to the overthrowing of the *Faith of some.*

2 Tim 2. 18.

Par. Now he tells us, *that he passes on to your second observation (on* 2 Pet. 3. 16.*) not finding any thing further in your first that is remarkable, save that in p.94. you again acknowledge, that those passages in Scripture that are of the greatest Concern, are written in such a plain and familiar style, that the weakest and most illiterate, or unlearned,* &c. *shall not be able to excuse the neglect of them,* &c. *p.216.*

Min. It's *T.E*'s old subtilties to call what he cannot answer *Minute and less material passages* †, and here he says *he do's not find any thing further that is remarkable*, when indeed he hath left unanswered the most remarkable passage of all, even that in *page* 91. of my Book; My Argument there was this, *If St.* Paul's *Epistles were hard then, in those days of primitive light and purity, and extraordinary inspiration, and even to those that were acquainted with the Original Languages, wherein they were written, and with the peculiar Proverbs and proprieties of them; If they were hard then to those who well understood the rites and customs of the people, to whom they were particularly written; and who might be easily informed of the particular occasion, and by that means of the true scope of them: How much more difficult must they needs be to us at this distance,* &c. This had been worth the Quaker's pains to have answered, and ours to dispute about. So that I have

† Preface to his Book.

have no reaſon to take any further notice of him, when thus he skips over the main of my Arguments. But neither you nor any other can remain unſatisfied of the Neceſſity of humane Learning, if you will peruſe a Treatiſe† on that Subject, written by Mr. *Reyner* of *Lincoln*.

† Printed Anno Dom. 1663.

Par. But methinks he yields the Cauſe, For he tells us, that *it is not their manner to deride Learning, or any way to undervalue it, which in its place is good and ſerviceable*, p. 217.

Min. I doubt His Party will ſcarce thank him for this Conceſſion, who for many years made it a great part of their Religion to decry it. One (whoſe Name is not affixt to his works) ſaith, that *the Original of Tongues was in the days of* Nimrod *that Heretick*. Though I muſt tell that Learned Antiquary, that *Nimrod* was rather an *Atheiſt* than *Heretick*. But I pray, wherein then is Learning good and ſerviceable?

Principles of the Quakers, p. 51.

In Natural, Civil, or Humane Affairs, p. 218.

Min. If ſo, why do's he make uſe of it himſelf in a *Controverſie of Religion?* And why do's he pretend ſo much to eſteem *that Learning*, which the Tranſlators of the Scripture made uſe of in that Work? *p.* 264.

Par. T. E. has one objection againſt humane Learning, *&c.* Which to me ſeems very conſiderable, and to have more in it, than the whole Chapter beſides. *If* (ſays he) *want of Humane Learning were the Cauſe why the Scriptures are wreſted, How comes it to paſs, that they are wreſted by thoſe that have Humane Learning? p.* 219.

Min. Seeing you look upon this objection as considerable, you shall have the fuller Answer to it.

Let us look back into former Ages, and we shall find that *No Heretick* was famous for Learning in the two first Centuries. *Montanus* was for Inspiration, as are the Quakers, and as horrible a Wrester of the Scriptures as they are, Calling himself the *Paraclet* or *Comforter* that was for to come. *Manes* was a *Persian* slave, void of all ingenuous literature and education, and He broached the *Manechæan* Heresie. *Arrius* was a Man of plausible eloquence, but of no great Learning. And I would have *T. E.* shew us any one of the Hereticks, that did come near to the profound Learning which was in those Glorious Lights of the Church, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostome*, *Hierome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, &c. These Holy Fathers were *some* of them admirably skill'd in Languages, *all* of them in Histories, Laws, Rites and Customs, yea in most of the Liberal Sciences, all which they *got by Education*: And he must be a Stranger to primitive times, who knows not, how God made use of the Learning and Eloquence of these Orthodox Fathers, to confound Heresies, as they did arise up in the World. If the Hereticks with their little learning did wrest some places of Scripture, these Hero's did rectifie such abused places, by which they both baffled their Adversaries, and confirmed the Truth; So that the Heretick got

got as little by those attempts, as *Ellwood* has by this Allegation; Which gives us but an opportunity to set an higher value upon Learning, seeing God has been pleased to use it as a means to secure His Holy Word in times of old: —— but to go on;

We may observe, that when by the furious inundation of the barbarous Nations into the *Roman* Empire, Learning fell into decay and when Arts and Sciences were discouraged and neglected, at the *same time* all manner of Corruptions crept into the Church; and as ignorance encreased, Errors multiplied; So that most of the present evil opinions of the Church of *Rome*, had their original in those Unlearned Ages, from about 700 years after Christ, and till about [redacted] years after; About the Midnight of which darkness, there was scarce any Learning left in the World; *It is wonderful* (saith *Sabellicus*) *what a General oblivion of Arts had seized on Mens minds* *. These were the unhappy times, which bred and nursed up Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Purgatory, with all the Fanatical Visions and Revelations, Miracles, *&c.* Then began Shrines, Pilgrimages, Reliques, Purchasing of Pardons, and the Popes attempts for an Universal Monarchy: To serve which ends, Scripture was wrested; Fathers, Councils, and Records corrupted and forged; while the World was asleep, and for want of Learning discerned not the Cheat, which is now so gross and palpable. And 'tis well worth our Notice what the Learned *Hottinger* observes (*viz.*) That the

* Ennead 9. lib. 1.

Canon of the Council of *Vienna*, *Anno* 1312. Commanding the ſtudy of the Oriental Languages in Europe, was *the happy dawning of the bleſſed Reformation*; For while ignorance overſpread the World, the Pope carried the Bell away, and had it generally at his Devotion. And *Canus* confeſſeth that *their Doctors for* 300 *years together, underſtood neither Greek nor Hebrew*; And *Lelius Tifernus Anno* 1470. had much ado to get leave to read Greek in the Univerſity of *Paris*; for as *Epenæus* tells us (*Com. ad* 2 *Tim.* 3.) *In that Age to underſtand Greek was ſuſpected, and to have skill in Hebrew almoſt enough to make a Man accounted an Heretick*: In thoſe times they could wreſt [**Eccè duo gladii** †] and [*Deus fecit duo Luminaria* ‖] to prove the **Pope** *above* the Emperour. But as ſoon as God reſtored Learning, the Reformation immediately followed; Which the wiſeſt Papiſts foreſaw: Hence *Platina* relates, that Pope *Paul* the ſecond (who lived about forty years before *Luther*) *was wont to Call all that ſtudied humane Learning, Hereticks, frequently admoniſhing the Romans not to bring up their Children in Learning*; Hence that famous ſaying of *Ludovicus Vives* his Maſter to him (which might very well fit the Mouth of *George Fox*) *The better Grammarian thou art, the worſe Divine thou wilt make.* And he that conſiders what oppoſition was made againſt *Reuchlin*, *Eraſmus*, and other Reſtorers of Learning, by the illiterate Monks of that Age, will diſcern, that the Popiſh Church did ſtrive as much to hinder the ſetting up of Learning,

† Luke 22. 38.
‖ Gen. 1. 16.
Vives de Cauſis lib. 2.

Learning, as the Quakers ſtrive to pull it down: And its well if *T. E.* and the Grandees of his Party (for all their big words againſt them) be not carrying on a Deſign for that People, who hold *Ignorance the Mother of Devotion.*

Par. But *T. E.* will have the *Cardinals, Jeſuites and Popiſh Prieſts in latter times* to be Learned men. p. 219.

Min. Some of them I confeſs were ſo, but it was the Excellent Learning of the Proteſtant Divines which forced them to it; as we may gather from *Andreas Veſſelius* Hebrew-profeſſor at *Lovain* in the time of Pope *Paul* the 5*th*, who hath theſe words, *We wonder at the Hereticks skill in Tongues, and all Learning, and they deride our Contempt of theſe things; Let us waſh off this blot, and joyn to Philoſophy the knowledge of Tongues**. Yet (bleſſed be God) the Learning of the Proteſtant Churches hath ever outvyed Them; In ſo much that of late the Popiſh Champions could never wreſt one ſingle place of Scripture, which hath not been reſcued from their falſe Gloſſes by the Learning of the Proteſtant Divines aſſiſted by God's Spirit. But what Lamentable abuſes might have been put upon Scripture, and what eaſy Victories would they have had, had all Proteſtants been as *illiterate* as the *Quakers* are?

* De rat. Stud. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 19.

By all this it appears, that Learning hath been the means, by which God hath Vindicated His Word from Wreſting; And that *Ignorant* perſons have been the greateſt Wreſters of it: Of which if more Proof be requiſite, let us look back to the unlearned Anabaptiſts of *Germany*

Canon of the Council of *Vienna*, *Anno* 1312. Commanding the ſtudy of the Oriental Languages in Europe, was *the happy dawning of the bleſſed Reformation*; For while ignorance overſpread the World, the Pope carried the Bell away, and had it generally at his Devotion. And *Canus* confeſſeth that *their Doctors for* 300 *years together, underſtood neither Greek nor Hebrew*; And *Lelius Tifernus Anno* 1470. had much ado to get leave to read Greek in the Univerſity of *Paris*; for as *Epenæus* tells us (*Com. ad* 2 *Tim.* 3.) *In that Age to underſtand Greek was ſuſpected, and to have skill in Hebrew almoſt enough to make a Man accounted an Heretick*: In thoſe times they could wreſt [*Ecce duo gladii* †] and [*Deus fecit duo Luminaria* ‖] to prove the **Pope** *above* the Emperour. But as ſoon as God reſtored Learning, the Reformation immediately followed; Which the wiſeſt Papiſts foreſaw: Hence *Platina* relates, that Pope *Paul* the ſecond (who lived about forty years before *Luther*) *was wont to Call all that ſtudied humane Learning, Hereticks, frequently admoniſhing the Romans not to bring up their Children in Learning*; Hence that famous ſaying of *Ludovicus Vives* his Maſter to him (which might very well fit the Mouth of *George Fox*) *The better Grammarian thou art, the worſe Divine thou wilt make.* And he that conſiders what oppoſition was made againſt *Reuchlin*, *Eraſmus*, and other Reſtorers of Learning, by the illiterate Monks of that Age, will diſcern, that the Popiſh Church did ſtrive as much to hinder the ſetting up of Learning,

† Luke 22. 38.
‖ Gen. 1. 16.
Vives de Cauſis lib. 2.

Learning, as the Quakers ſtrive to pull it down: And its well if *T. E.* and the Grandees of his Party (for all their big words againſt them) be not carrying on a Deſign for that People, who hold *Ignorance the Mother of Devotion.*

Par. But *T. E.* will have the *Cardinals, Jeſuites and Popiſh Prieſts in latter times* to be Learned men. p. 219.

Min. Some of them I confeſs were ſo, but it was the Excellent Learning of the Proteſtant Divines which forced them to it; as we may gather from *Andreas Veſſelius* Hebrew-profeſſor at *Lovain* in the time of Pope *Paul* the 5*th*, who hath theſe words, *We wonder at the Hereticks ſkill in Tongues, and all Learning, and they deride our Contempt of theſe things; Let us waſh off this blot, and joyn to Philoſophy the knowledge of Tongues**. Yet (bleſſed be God) the Learning of the Proteſtant Churches hath ever outvyed Them; In ſo much that of late the Popiſh Champions could never wreſt one ſingle place of Scripture, which hath not been reſcued from their falſe Gloſſes by the Learning of the Proteſtant Divines aſſiſted by God's Spirit. But what Lamentable abuſes might have been put upon Scripture, and what eaſy Victories would they have had, had all Proteſtants been as *illiterate* as the *Quakers* are?

* De rat. Stud. Theol. lib. 1. cap. 19.

By all this it appears, that Learning hath been the means, by which God hath Vindicated His Word from Wreſting; And that *Ignorant* perſons have been the greateſt Wreſters of it: Of which if more Proof be requiſite, let us look back to the unlearned Anabaptiſts of *Germany*

many (in the last Century) the *Progenitors* of our Quakers *Thomas Muntzor*, *John* of *Leyden*, *Knipperdolling*, &c. with *Heiman* the *Cobler*, *Theodore* the *Butcher*, who attempted to set up Christs Kingdom by a bloody Rebellion, and Abusing of Scripture: Yea this is confirmed to us by the Miseries of this Church in our late unhappy times; when any Mechanick took upupon him to preach, and expound Scripture so long, till they put more Thorns about our Saviours *Doctrine*, than the *Jews* ever did about His Head; And divided this poor Nation into innumerable Sects and parties, under which it groaneth; And broached as wild Errours, as ever were heard before. So that St. *Peter* did truly observe, that Unlearned men do wrest the Scriptures.

Perhaps *T. E.* may pick up some men of Learning, who out of base ends, peeks, and prejudices have wrested the Scripture: but this is so far from proving *Learning Unnecessary*, that it shews it to be the more Needful; for if Theeves wear Swords for to rob and kill, ought not Honest men so much the rather wear them in their own defence.?

Par. You have satisfied me abundantly, so that we shall find little more upon this point worth the taking notice of: Only *T. E.* has found out a way to make Tongues unnecessary, *for illiterate men may speak by interpreters* p. 221. Yet afterwards he tells us, that *Tongues were given to the Apostles, to enable them so to express themselves in every Nations proper Dialect, that they might understand what was spoken to them.* p. 223. *Min.*

Min. It ſeems then, They were *requiſite*, and They were *not requiſite*; They were requiſite to enable them to Preach intelligibly to all Nations; And yet not requiſite, ſeeing *this* might have been done by an Interpreter. The fallacy then, which he pretends to be in *My* Argument, will manifeſtly appear to be in *his own*.

Beſides, What a ridiculous Method is this, which he preſcribes of an Interpreter? For if the Preacher underſtand not the Language of that people whom he is to inſtruct, the Interpreter muſt, who is to know two Tongues at leaſt, that he may interpret *one* by the *other*; And ſince *Interpretation of Tongues* ‖ was a Miraculous Gift in thoſe days, as well as *Speaking with Tongues*, the Quakers way is not eaſier at all, it being indifferent, whether the Miracle be wrought by the *Preacher* or by the *Interpreter:*

‖ 1. Cor. 14.

Now if Skill in Tongues be Learning, then were the Apoſtles Learned in that point; *Theirs* came by *Miracle*, *Ours* by Gods *Bleſſing* upon our *Study* and *Endeavours*; And though we come diverſly by it, yet the *Skill* is the *ſame*: And though *T. E.* ſeems to ſeparate the Gifts of Tongues from the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, *p.* 222. Yet we know, They both came together; Neither can we be ſo abſurd, as to fancy, the Spirit gave the Apoſtles words without Senſe, or that he taught them like Parrots to talk without underſtanding.

Now becauſe this *Knowledg*, and *Skill* to expreſs *it*, is not in this age given to any man without

without means, namely, Reading and Study; Therefore it is that we preſs a neceſſity of Learning in the Miniſters of the Goſpel.

If it be enquired now, of what uſe Tongues were to the Apoſtles, I ſhall grant that they were given to them (who had knowledge without Study) to enable them to ſpeak properly to all Nations in their own Dialect. Now though Tongues be not neceſſary to us for *this* purpoſe, yet are they neceſſary for *other* purpoſes (*viz.*) To enable us to compare the Original with the ſeveral Oriental Verſions, to fit us for the reading of Ancient Hiſtorians, Expoſitors, and other Authors of ſuch Sciences as are uſeful handmaids to Divinity, Which are generally written in *Greek* and *Latine*, without the knowledge of which Tongues we cannot know the ſignification and proprieties of words, the ſenſe of phraſes, the variety of Cuſtoms, the Hiſtory of times, the expoſition of the Holy Fathers, the practice of the Primitive Church, the frauds of Hereticks, *&c.* The Apoſtles needed the Tongues to expreſs themſelves, having notions by inſpiration: We need them as well to inform us in the Notions of things, as properly, pertinently and Methodically to expreſs our ſelves, even in our own Country (this will ſerve to anſwer another of his objections.) And ſo Tongues *were* and *are* Neceſſary for the *Apoſtles* and for *us*, for *thoſe* times and *theſe* times; And None wholly illiterate either *then* were, or *now* are fit to preach the Goſpel.

Par. You told me, there was great reaſon why

why illiterate men were at first chosen, *&c. T. E.* says, *The Reason holds good still.* p. 225.

Min. Are *We* and *They* then in the same circumstances? Surely different Times require different Dispensations. But here I must ask, Why the *Comparison* between Gods raining down Manna in the Wilderness, and the ceasing thereof when that People was settled in the Land of *Canaan*, *with* the extraordinary and ordinary State of the Church, was omitted by this Quaker? But I must confess, he has provided himself a brave *Salvo* to call any thing a *Minute passage*, which he knows not how to answer. See Fr. Conf. p. 100.

Par. Though he takes no notice of the Comparison, yet he do's of the Inference; for he thinks, *You are to blame for inferring from thence a Necessity of Humane Learning in Ordinary times.* p. 226.

Min. A more senseless remark cannot be made; Unless Humane Learning had been an extraordinary thing, and acquired only in an extraordinary manner.

Par. However he saith that *Teaching of the Spirit had no dependency upon Tongues; it was before them, and was to continue after them* ibid.

Min. This is false, for they were given *both* at one time: But if he mean, that the Ordinary teaching of the Spirit was to continue after them, I say as much. But then his not distinguishing between the *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary* teaching of the Spirit, has here run him into some gross Absurdities for two or three pages together.

First

1. Absurd. *First* he supposes All Christian Believers to be the Apostles successors, as if there were no difference between the Preacher and the Hearer, between Priest and People, when the Apostles selected their successors from out of the company of Ordinary Christians: And the Distinction has been ever kept up in all Ages since.

2. Absurd. *Secondly*, The Quaker pleads *alike* for all Believers, as if they had *All* the inward and immediate Teaching *p.* 229. and takes those places 1 *John.* 2. 20, 27. *Ye know all things* ——— *and need not that any man teach you* &c. without Limitation. Hence it follows, that the Apostles taught in vain; And so not only Ministers pains are in vain, but the Quakers own Preachments; for if All were & are immediately taught, what need *was* or *is* there of any of these?

3. Absurd. *Thirdly*, The Quaker seems to fancy, that if the *Spirit be not with Believers in this immediate Manner*, *He is not with them at all.* p. 230. and *that Christ hath left His people comfortless*; as if the people in *Canaan*, where they plowed and sowed, were not fed by Gods Providence, as well as in the Wilderness. We know that it is the Spirit, that blesseth our Learning, and to as useful purposes (considering our Circumstances) as if we had that Immediate Teaching, which the Quakers do but dream of.

Par. He would make his Reader believe, that you are of opinion, *that the Apostles received the knowledge of the Gospel by Tongues.* p. 231. *Min.*

Min. He wrongs me infinitely, I put in *Miracles and the rest.* Immediate knowledge and Tongues are by me usually reckoned together, because the Apostles received them together; and they were Miraculous effects of the Spirit, *both* temporary and extraordinary, and *both* fitted to that Season; And Immediate Teaching is as little to be expected now, as the Gift of Tongues, which was not so Miraculous as *immediate teaching*; it being a greater wonder, that ignorant men should be acquainted with All *Heavenly Truthes*, as speak All *Earthly Languages.*

Methinks, when Quakers talk of this *Immediate Teaching*, it's as some do of the Philosophers Stone; for while they boast of it, they should shew us One man that *Actually* hath it. And for all their pretences, we see some of them do not depend upon it, but make use of Humane Means, and do read and study, and when they falsly quote an Author, can pretend they were in the *Countrey*, &c. And we all know, that the Quakers being generally devoid of Learning, their discourses, and writings are fuller of tautologies, solœcisms, confusion and darkness, than any other sort of people whatsoever; Whereas if they had the Immediate teaching as the Apostles had, their Notions would be *clear*, their discourses *Methodical* and *Argumentative*, as those of the Apostles were. And wee see they are so far from it, that even *T. E.* a pretender to Learning as well as to this inspiration, is often detected of gross ignorance, impertinence, and self-contradiction

diction, in this little Tract. All the Knowledge therefore, that we expect now, must be attain'd only by Gods blessing upon our due use of Means. 'Tis certain, that the best Quaker of them all, did he not read, study, converse &c. would be as ignorant as a Barbarous *Indian*; and till they can give us an example to the contrary, this pretence of theirs must pass for an absolute imposture.

Par. But *T. E.* thinks, that He has catch't you in a contradiction, because you say, that *Necessary Truths are already Revealed in Scripture*; yet you confess that *you want the Assistance of the Spirit to help you to understand them* p. 236.

Min. He forgets that here He do's contradict Himself; Before, *I made humane Learning All in all*, now (it seems) *I make the ordinary assistance of the Spirit Necessary.*——— But to the point; If it be a contradiction to pray for the assistance of the Spirit, for the understanding of what is Revealed, Then is His *Worship* guilty of the same contradiction; for he tells us *p.* 237, 238. that *the Doctrines contained in the Holy Scriptures cannot be comprehended or understood by the Wit and Wisdom of man (in his highest Natural attainments) but only and alone by the Openings and Discoveries of that holy Spirit, by which they were at first Revealed.* So that I must retort his own words * , If it cannot be understood, *it's not Revealed but Vailed.* My wonder is, that this Quaker quarrels not with the last book in Scripture; seeing it's the hardest to be understood

p. 236.

ſtood, yet called *The Revelation of Jeſus Christ.* And I muſt tell the Quaker, that whatſoever is made *publick* is revealed, whether every body underſtand it or no. Rev 1.1.

Par. As for New Revelations, he thinks it is *a phraſe of your own, not uſed by them.* p. 237.

Min. 'Tis well known, that I am not the inventer of it; And though *T. E.* diſowns the *phraſe*, yet you ſee he defends the *thing*; and if we muſt not call them *New Revelations*, we muſt then call them *New Impoſtures.*

Have not divers Quakers ſtript themſelves ſtark naked, and ſaid the Spirit bid them deliver ſuch and ſuch a Meſſage in that poſture? Muſt not then this be a New Revelation in their own ſenſe?

I ſhall be glad to hear that all Quakers were really become (as their Champion *Elwood* pretends they are) of another mind; It would be very well, would they at laſt renounce all revelations, which are not contained in the Scripture, and ſearch out the ſenſe of what is already Revealed, which they may do with the ordinary aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, and His bleſſing on the uſe of means, ſo far as is needful to their own Salvation.

Thus far I ſhall agree with *T. E.* that Outward means without the Spirit of God will not make us ſavingly to underſtand the Scriptures, *Provided* that he will add, that the Spirit will not help *thoſe*, who *neglect* to uſe the means, ſo far as their condition and capacity do extend unto.

Now

Now as for thoſe that expect New Revelations, or immediate Teaching (that is a Teaching without means) ſuch do render the Scriptures uſeleſs altogether: For he that hath immediately the ſame Truthes *from the ſame fountain, from whence the Scriptures do flow*, will not value the Scriptures at all; for who will value a *Copy*, that hath the *Original?* 'Tis the conceit of this Teaching, that hath made many of the Quakers deſpiſe the Scriptures; *What need have ſuch* (ſays one of them) *of Scripture-teaching without them, when they have received the ſame Spirit within them* *? Another, whom I could name, ſaid to a Credible Perſon, *That it had been better for him, had he never read the Bible.*

* G. Bateman's Ans. to Mr. Legard p. 21.

Par. But you affirmed the *Scriptures were a Perfect Rule*; this ſticks in his teeth: And whereas you proved it by 2. *Tim.* 3. 17. He confeſſes the *Scriptures to be profitable, but hopes the Prieſt will not ſay, Every thing that is profitable, is a perfect and ſufficient rule.* p. 247.

Min. It's well, if My Gentleman put not on a falſe Vizard, for this is the foundation-Principle of all Popery, *to deny that the Scripture is a perfect Rule*; And under this ſconce all their other Errours do take Sanctuary; wherefore the Papiſts call the Scripture *a Leaden Rule, a dead Judge, merum putamen ſine nucleo, a meer Nut-ſhell without a Kernel.* That the Fathers are clear in this point, as well againſt the Papiſts as their Friend *Ellwood*, may be ſeen in the *Conference* P. 105. which he paſſes by.

That

That the Scripture is a ſufficient Rule, the Apoſtle proves ſufficiently 2. *Tim.* 3. 15,16,17. Do's not St. *Paul* ſay there, that *they are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation through Faith?* Which they could not do, were there not a Rule in order to that Salvation: For the main uſe of a Rule is to direct us in the way we ſhould go in.

The Apoſtle proceeds to enumerate the ſeveral particulars, wherein the Scriptures may by us be profitably made uſe of; They are *profitable* (ſays he) *for Doctrine*, *for Reproof*, *for Correction*, *for Inſtruction*, Which contain all the intents and purpoſes of a Rule.

To ſhew that the Scripture hath all the Perfection that a Rule can have, the Apoſtle adds, *that the man of God may be perfect*, *thoroughly furniſhed unto all good Works*. Let this Quaker therefore beware how he digs up Foundations; eſpecially conſidering, how *many* places there are which make *the Law of the Lord Perfect*, &c. Which for brevity ſake, I muſt omit.

I expected that *T. E.* in this *Chapter* of Learning would have ſhewed us his greateſt skill and accuracy, but I find my ſelf deceived his pages being filled only with pitiful ſhifts and evations; Leſt therefore I ſhould weary you, I muſt deſire you to paſs to the next and laſt Chapter of his Book; eſpecially conſidering, there is a *Tract* now in preſs called [*Chriſtianity No Enthuſiaſm*] which anſwers all his pretenſions to *immediate Teaching*.

Par. I shall only then desire you to take notice, that he concludes this Chapter with the Testimonies of *Tindall*, *Jewel*, *Bradford*, *Philpot* and *Bullinger*, all which argue a Necessity of the Spirit in order to the interpreting of Scripture.

See Jewels Treatise of the H. Scriptures p. 36 and the First part of his defence, &c. p. 62 63, 65.

Min. I have seriously consider'd their words, and do find that they either speak of the practicable knowledge of the Scriptures, which is only to be had from the Grace of the Spirit, or else of the Ordinary teaching of Gods Spirit in the use of means.

But where do's he find that any of these relyed on *immediate Inspiration*, or disputed against the use of *Humane Learning* in Divinity? Or do you think that the Quaker *observed His decorum* in giving *Philpot* the Reverend Title of a [*Learned Martyr*] in this Chapter against Learning. *p.* 275? But to shew that *T. E.* has abused the Learned and Pious *Philpot*; And that I maintain No notion of Learning different from Him; Let us hear his own words, *I confess* (saith he) *that Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, and I acknowledge that God appointeth an Ordinary means for men to come unto knowledge now, and not miraculously, as He hath done in times past; yet we that be taught by Men, must take heed that we learn nothing, but that which was taught in the Primitive Church by Revelation.*

Foxs Martyrol. Vol. 3 p. 376.

Par. One thing I wonder at (*viz.*) That *T. E.* should not say [*Bishop Jewel*] (he having been Bishop of *Salisbury*) as well as [*Bishop*

[*Bishop Gauden*] and [*Bishop Taylor*;] but barely styles him *John Jewel a zealous defender of the Protestant Religion.* p. 273.

Min. You will the less wonder, if you consider that the design of *Ellwoods* Book is to blind and delude the ignorant Common people (for he can hardly fancy, that men, whose Reason has been improved by Consideration and education, can be imposed upon by so many apparent fallacies.) Now should He have called him *Bishop Jewel*, then would the most Vulgar have made this Remark (*viz.*) *that a man may be a Bishop, and yet a zealous defender of the Protestant Religion.*

But if *T.* E's design be to prove, *that Gods people cannot be without the assistance of His Holy Spirit*, he needed not to have gone to Bishop *Jewel*, Arch-Deacon *Philpot* and the rest; He might have brought as plain Proofs, and with more Authority from the Book of Common prayer, from the Articles and Homilies of the Church of *England.* And if I say any thing to the contrary, I will submit to the severest puninshment for so high a Crime.

Par. I should give you no further Trouble upon this point, but for one odd passage which I had like to have forgot. He says, *The Faith which They have received, is the same with that of the Primitive Christians.* p. 245.

Min. Then let me give you a Testimony or two of their Opinion in this matter.

Eusebius (in his Ecclesiastical History lib. 5. c. 9. tells us of one *Pantænus* (who lived in the Second Century) that *He was a famous Learn-*

ed man, and Moderator in the School of Alexandria; And that *of Old disputation and exercise in Holy Scripture did flourish among them, being instituted by such men as excelled in Eloquence.*

The same *Eusebius* informs us, that *Origen perswaded to the Study of Liberal Sciences, affirming them advantagious to the knowledge of Holy Scriptures, being of an opinion, that the exercise of Philosophical Discipline was very necessary and profitable.*

It was an unhappy Project of *Julian* the Apostate to extirpate Christianity by destroying *All Schools* of Literature and Education; *for by this means* (saith he) *if we suffer them, We are beaten with our own Weapons* *. And the Christians complained of this *as a very great grievance*; Which shews, that they both *used* Learning and *highly valued it* also.

Saint *Augustine* allows the knowledg of Philosophy and other Heathen Learning to be useful in order to the expounding of Scripture, and compares it to *the Israelites spoiling of the* Egyptrians *to adorn the Tabernacle* †; And saith that *Saint Cyprian, Lactantius, Victorinus, Optatus and Hilarius were rarely furnished with these spoils* ‖.

Saint *Hierome* was brought up in Learning from his Youth: And before he set upon explaining the Scripture, *he Learned the Hebrew Tongue* * (*long after he was a man*;) And he highly commended *the Mother of* Rusticus (*who was designed for the Ministry*) *that she brought him up in All kind of Learning* †. And he

* Propriis pennis configimus; ex nostris enim libris arma capiunt; &c. Theodor. l. 3. c. 8.

† Hist. Tripart. lib. 6. c. 17.

‖ De doct. Chr. lib. 2. c. 40.

* *Hieron.* Ep. 4.

† ibid.

he adviſes Miniſters, *that they be long in Learning what they are to teach unto others* ‖.

‖ See Ep. 3. p. 76.

I could produce infinite Teſtimonies to ſhew How Learning was encouraged by the Ancient Chriſtians; And for *this kind of Inſpiration* which *Ellwood* talks of, it was never pretended, from the time of the Heretick *Montanus*, till St. *Francis* pretended to this point of Quakeriſm, and other Fanatical Popiſh Fryars, and Monks, the Modern Enemies of all ingenuous Education.

So that I hope the Quakers Champion has been ſo far from putting you out of Conceit with Learning, that he hath raiſed your eſteem and opinion of it.

CHAP. IX.

Of Tithes.

PAR. T.E. begins his Chapter of Tithes with railing, and ſaith, *that he is got to the Prieſts Dalilah, the very darling and minion of the Clergy*, p. 277.

Min. But rather (if the Quaker pleaſe) Tithes are that which an Engliſh man calls *Property*, and I hope will be ever eſteemed ſo, for all his *Billingsgate* Rethorick: But to wave thir (for I dare not encounter my Adverſary in ſcolding) I muſt remind you, that the firſt thing which you propoſed to me upon this Subject, was an Argument of *Edward Burroughs*

in his plea to the King and Council, who ſaid it was *a denying of Chriſt to uphold any part of the firſt Prieſthood, that gave and received Tithes, &c.* to which I anſwered, *that if by the firſt Prieſthood he meant that of* Aarons, *than had he preſented to the King and Council a Notorious falſity in affirming it to be the firſt, there being a Prieſt before him, to whom* Levi *himſelf paid his Tithes*, Heb.7.9. *Or if by the firſt Prieſthood he meant that of* Melchizedeck's, *the falſity was no leſs Notorious in ſaying, that Prieſthood is ended, which Chriſt exerciſeth for ever*, Heb.7,17.

Conf. p. 132,133.

Par. This indeed I told you *was a great ſcruple to me*, and your anſwer was no leſs ſatisfactory: and I expected that *T. E.* here would have ſhew'd his art, but I found my ſelf deceived; for he hath left *Burroughs* in the lurch, and given the World an occaſion to look upon him as a meer Cheat and Impoſtor.

Min. Its ſtrange that he ſhould paſs by ſo conſiderable a paſſage, and the very firſt thing inſiſted on; but you will wonder indeed, when I tell you (that if a certain letter may be credited, ſubſcribed by *Iſaac Pennington*) *Edward Burroughs* was an occaſion of his *convincement* (He ſhould have ſaid ſeducement.) Of all Quakers, one would have thought *E.B.* ſhould not have been deſerted: Is it not ſtrange that *T. E.* who abounds with Sophiſms and Fallacies, ſhould not have one left him at ſuch a pinch as this, when the credit and reputation of His Patriarch *Burroughs* was ſo eminently concern'd? I pray God he may lay it

to

to heart, and that in order to his own eternal good, that this *Burroughs*, who was the unhappy Inſtrument of his Apoſtacy from the Proteſtant Religion eſtabliſht in the Church of *England*, had not that Inſpiration which we have been diſcourſing of, and of which the Quakers ſo vainly boaſt.

Par. I ſee one thing very plainly, that where *T. E.* has not the wit to anſwer any of your Arguments, he has however the cunning to paſs them by: For He has skipt over four pages, and the firſt thing that he enquires into is, *whether Tithes were due to* Melchiſedeck, *that which ſhould make them due* (ſays He) *muſt be a command*, p. 277.

Min. You know that *Abraham built an Altar to the Lord His God who appeared to him:* Gen. 12.7. Now according to *T. E.* that was a ſuperfluous ſervice, not a due to God, becauſe we do not read that any where He had commanded it.

Par. I ſuppoſe that *T. E.* is ſenſible that *Melchizedeck* was a Type of Chriſt, and that if Tithes were due to the Type, they are No leſs due to the Antitype; wherefore he produces three Arguments to prove that Tithes were not his due: *Firſt*, *Becauſe* Moſes *ſays expreſly, that he gave him Tithes: And that the Apoſtle uſeth the ſame Phraſe: Now to give imports one thing; to pay another*, p. 278.

Min. That the Phraſe imports no ſuch things will appear, when we obſerve the very ſame in other Scriptures: As for example, *My ſon* (ſaith *Joſhua*) [*Give*] *glory to God*, do's this imply that [*Glory*] is not God Almigh- Joſ. 7.19

ties due, any further than Man is pleased to *give* it to him? *(Secondly)* The Apostle, who gives the best account of the Phrase, has it in these words, Δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ *He Tithed* Abraham. Now since *T. E.* pretends to understand Greek, and this passage being in my Book, How came he to pass it by? this I am perswaded, had he not found it true, it would not have escaped his lash; wherefore do I suspect, that here He offers an Argument directly against his own knowledge and Conscience.

Par. His second reason is this, *Had Tithes been due to* Melchizedeck, *then must* Abraham *have paid* Melchizedeck *Tithes of all his substance*, p. 279.

Min. We know nothing to the contrary, but that he did so; and I can affirm the one, as well as He deny the other.

Par. But the main is behind: *We do not read* (says He) *that He gave him Tithes of his own Estate; but that which he gave him the Tenth of was the Spoils*, ibid.

Min. This was answered in the *Conference* also: *It not being material out of what he paid His Tithes, but whatever they were*, Abraham *paid them as a Tithe, and* Melchizedek *receeived them as a Priest.* p. 135.

But seeing he insists so much upon this, I shall add, That the Spoils were in strictness his own Estate, having obtained them with the hazard of his Life, in a just and righteous War. But if it were not so, that they were not his, than will an eternal infamy ly upon

on the *Father of the Faithful*, and *the Priest of the most High God*, in disposing and receiving of that which (in right) belonged to other Men.

Par. But (Thirdly) (says *T. E.*) which seems to me a meer trifle, *the occasion*, &c. *seems altogether accidental*, ibid.

Min. That is, accidentally *Abraham* met with an *occasion* & opportunity to discharge His duty.

As meer an accidental passage, as the Quaker would have this to be, yet the Apostle draws a solid Argument from thence; and whoever reads the *7th* Chapter to the *Hebrews* will find, that the Apostles design there is to prove the Priesthood of *Melchizedeck's* above that of *Levi's*, from a threefold Argument. *(First) He received Tithes of* Abraham, or he Tithed him, *v. 6. (Secondly)* He blessed him, *and without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better*, *v. 7. (Thirdly)* The Apostle proves it the greater and the more blessed Priesthood from the duration of it: *For thou art a Priest for ever after the order of* Mechizedeck, *v. 17.*

Now if the account that *Elwood* hath given of these two great Men be true, then has the Apostle quite lost his Argument; therefore let us compare *T. E's* Discourse, and the Apostles together.

Is *Melchizedeck's* Priesthood greater or better than that of *Aarons*, because *Abraham* gave him Tithes? that cannot be: *For Tithes were none of his due, neither did* Abraham *pay them duly, Nor was there in those days any publick worship, wherein He could perform any outward*

ward Prieſtly Office (As if *Melchizedeck* was a meer Cypher, bore the Name of a Prieſt, but did not the Work and Office of a Prieſt.) *It's true* Abraham *gave him Tithes, but he did not pay him Tithes: And when all is done, it was but an accidental buſineſs*, and will not bear an Argument. With what dint of Argument might a Jew (upon *Ellwoods* Principles) implead Chriſtianity it ſelf? *What*, Melchizedecks *Prieſthood above* Aarons, *becauſe* Abraham *gave him Tithes? that's falſe even from Chriſtian Principles: Did not Jeſus himſelf ſay, that it was more bleſſed to give than to receive?* Abraham *was the giver*, Melchizedeck *was but the receiver; wherefore the Prieſthood in* Abrahams *loins was the greater Prieſthood, the more bleſſed Prieſthood.* So that if we purſue the Quakers Argument to the far end, with Tithes it overturns not only the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, but indeed the very foundation of Chriſtianity.

Acts 20. 35.

Par. You have given me very good ſatisfaction, as to your Miniſtry, in your reply to *T. E's* firſt Chapter; I ſhall therefore paſs by His Canting expreſſions, that you *are made Prieſt after the Law of a carnal Commandment*, which I ſuppoſe, related to the bloody Sacrifices under the *Levitical* Law: But then whereas you aſſerted, that maintenance in general to the Miniſters of the Goſpel *is juſt, reaſonable, and eſtabliſht by a Divine Authority*; He quite contrary to my expectation *grants it* p. 284.

Min. Maintenance it ſeems then is due: Now I would know, what could poſſibly have been ſet out for that maintenancce leſs obnoxious to exception than Tithes are.

Par.

Par. Nothing that I know of, but Men of *Corahs* temper would have quarrelled with it. But as for those Scriptures from which you urged this Maintenance, *The Apostles intent (He saith) is not to set out what the Maintenance is, as who they are, from whom it is to be received, Namely, such as receive their Ministry.* ibid. 1 Cor. 9. Gal. 6. 6.

Min. I answer (*First*) Nothing can be more plain, than that the Apostles drift in these Scriptures is, to oblige the People to set forth a maintenance for their Ministers, and those instances of *the Ox treading out the Corn*, &c. shew the equity and reasonableness thereof. (*Secondly*) The question being whether the Ministers of the Gospel ought to be provided for out of mens Estate, for their work and labour in their Ministry; This I perceive is fairly yielded: But then did *T.E.* consider, How this very thing has been opposed all along by his own party, and how miserably they have abused that Text, *freely have ye received, freely give?* However we may fairly inferr from his own words, that they who are *fed* by us, *taught* by us, *planted*, &c. ought not to withhold our maintenances from us. But then (*Thirdly*) The next Question will be this; Whether those who withdraw themselves from the publick Ordinances, are for that reason excusable in withdrawing our maintenances? If this be so, *T.E.* has found out a right expedient, to make all indifferent Men turn either Atheists, or Schismaticks in point of interest. But then I must desire

deſire their Friend *Ellwood* to take notice, that if they be not *fed*, *taught*, *and planted* by us, the fault is in themſelves, and for which we ought not to ſuffer. (*Fourthly*) The Fallacy and Cheat lies here, that the Quaker do's not diſtinguiſh between the firſt Donors of Tithes, and the preſent payers of Tithes, who are conſidered in the Rent or Purchaſe for the Tithes they pay, which I made plain to you at our firſt Conference, and ſhall (I hope) make more plain before we part.

Par. He is got into a fit of railing again, an ſays, *though Chriſt deny them, yet if Man will grant them, it will ſerve your turn as well*, p. 287.

Min. Where (I wonder) do's Chriſt *deny them?* Had the Quaker proved this, He had moſt effectually done his Work: But He is ſo far from proving this falſe Aſſertion, that when I am challenging the Quakers for about four pages together, to prove Tithes a ſin, that is to ſay, the tranſgreſſion of any Law, Humane or Divine, *T. E.* p. 151, &c. is not ſo *hardy*, as to make any manner of reply; though he could not but know, that it was the moſt conſiderable paſſage that I had.

Par. You may be ſure *T. E.* was wiſe enough to paſs by thoſe paſſages? For I ſuppoſe He knew neither how to anſwer your Argument, nor vindicate the Reputation of his own Party, whom you had render'd both ridiculous and diſhoneſt, in Jer. 5. 31. the application of that Text, *The Prieſts bear Rule by their Means*, to Tithes or other

other Eſtates, when i related to the Prophets who *prophefied falſly*, and by *their* [*Means*] or by reaſon thereof, the Prieſts than uſurped an Authority: Now it ſeems the Quakers in their groſs Ignorance took [*Means*] there for Eſtates, *&c.* and *T. E.* not knowing how to excuſe this, puts it into the Catologue of *Minute paſſages.*

Min. I would now know of *T.E.* wherein conſiſts immediate teaching. Had I nothing to object againſt the Quakers but this very paſſage, comparing it with the Notion of Inſpiration, its ſufficient to prove them very Cheats, and to draw any ſerious Man from their ways, making a plain diſcovery what that Spirit is, by which they are guided and directed; and that this Text has been ſo abuſed, ſee that Tract (before mentioned to you) called ſome of the Quakers Principles, put forth by *Iſaac Pennington*, and the ſecond Quaker there has this paſſage.

But to return to his Goſpel maintainance, *which* (He ſays) *is expreſly ſet down by Chriſt, eat ſuch things as are ſet before you; eat and drink ſuch things as they give*, p. 276. According to this Rule Tithes are a Goſpel-maintenance, which have been *expreſly ſet before us, expreſly given us.* And if Tithes were not *Melchizedeck's* due before ſuch time as *Abraham* gave him them; yet when they wete ſo given him, they were without all diſpute, which will ſufficiently make good our Title to Tithes (could we lay no other claim unto them) wherefore

wherefore it was that I ſaid before, *that if they were not due by a Divine appointment, yet are they now due by a voluntary dedication of them.*

Par. It's from thoſe words that He infers, *that though Chriſt deny them, and Men give them, it will ſerve your turn.*

Min. Could a more malicious and uncharitable interpretation be put upon my words? *Ananias* and *Saphira* (without any poſitive appointment) dedicated the Money, which they raiſed upon the ſale of their Eſtate, to the uſe of the Church: Might not *Ellwood* have replied upon St. *Peter*, and the reſt, *Though Chriſt deny that Money, yet if* Ananias *and* Saphira *give it, it will ſerve your turn?*

Par. Now T.E. takes notice of my query, how *the dedication of Tithes appeared*; and ſaith the Anſwer, *O! you need not ſcruple the point*, ibid.

Min. The *Interjection* [*O*] is put in by himſelf, as before, *p.* 32. to put more Emphaſis upon my words, than ever was intended by me, and to make more room for his ſcurrility, as if the ſtrength of my Argument depended upon that ſingle paſſage: but let us paſs by his Immoralities to his Arguments.

Par. He ſaith you *ground your claim upon the famous Charter of King* Ethelwolf. p. 288.

Min. This is falſe, The Church was poſſeſſed of Tithes long before his days: but it was the ſolemn dedication of them (whereby all Diſputes concerning them was taken away) that I grounded upon that Charter.

But What concerns King *Ethelwolf's* Charter, *&c.* you'l find anſwered in another Book

Book intituled *The Right Of Tithes*, *&c.* which is a fuller anſwer to all the main paſſages of this Chapter, than I could conveniently make, without ſwelling this reply much bigger than I am willing to publiſh it.

Par. I ſhall then only propound his chief objections. *T. E.* ſpends ſome Pages to prove moſt groſs corruptions in that Charter.

Min. Some Corruptions there might be, even as there was in *Aſa*'s Reign, who tho He ſuffered the High places to remain, *yet nevertheleſs His heart was perfect with the Lord all his days.* So there might be ſome great defects in *Ethelwolfs* Charter: Yet having no Idolatrous deſign, but an honeſt zeal, that thoſe whom he eſteemed Miniſters of Chriſt might be provided for. And what can be more uncharitable than to make a damnable Idolater of him, for doing ſomething, tho it were in an ill manner, through invincible ignorance. 1. Kings 15. 14.

Magna Charta, or the grand Charter of *England*, runs thus. *Henricus Dei gratia Rex Angliæ* &c. *Archiepiſcopis, Ducibus* &c. *Sciatis quod Nos intuitu Dei, & pro ſalute animæ meæ, & animarum Anteceſſorum, & ſucceſſorum Noſtrorum* &c. That is, He grants this Charter upon this ſeeming pretence, that it was for *the good of his Soul, and for the Souls of His Anceſtors and ſucceſſors.* Now ſhall we argue that this was Idolatry, and therefore *Magna Charta* was *ipſo facto* voyd? And that the *Engliſh* Subjects ought to quit all the Privi-

Priviledges that they claim by it?

Now ſuppoſe the obliquity as great as *T. E.* pretends in *Ethelwolfs* Charter, yet the dedication of the Tithes being to God, no blemiſh therein can alter their property.

Par. To prove this you inſtanc't in the caſe of the Cenſers, which the 250 men offer'd, which becauſe offer'd to God, you proved from *Numb.* 16. and 37. they were not to be alienated to Common uſe: But to this He anſwers, *that there was a particular reaſon why the Cenſers were to be kept. Tet tho they were thus taken up, they were not permitted to be uſed, or imployed in that ſervice, to and for which they were dedicated, but being wrought out into broad Plates, the property of them was altered, before they were allowed to be uſed.* p. 296.

Min. Here I muſt tell my Adverſary (in his own Dialect) *that He treads light, as if he meant to ſhew us a pair of heels.* If the queſtion were, why they were made broad Plates; Then we ſhould find an anſwer. v. 40. *to be a memorial to the Children of Iſrael, that no ſtranger which is not of the Seed of Abraham, come near to offer Incenſe before the Lord, &c.* But this is not the queſtion, I ask why they were hallowed: Here's the point, which is plainly reſolved ver. 38. *for they offered them before the Lord, therefore they are hallowed.*

But was there ever a more groſs abſurdity than to ſay their property was altered, becauſe allowed as to their uſe, *by being wrought out into*

into broad Plates? A Noble man turns a Manſion-Houſe into Tenements, or into an Exchange, is not His property to that houſe the ſame which it was before?

Par. But He tells us that *Tithes, and other ſuch like Oblations are alienable, and in this Nation have been legally alienated to common uſes* p. 298.

Min. I confeſs that *Henry* the Eighth did alienate them: And ſo did He alſo eſtabliſh the Six bloody Articles, to ſhew himſelf as ill a friend to Proteſtants as to Tithes: But is not this a wiſe Argument, to prove that Sacriledge may *de jure* be committed, becauſe *de facto* it hath been committed?

Seeing the Quaker talks ſo big againſt Idolatry, I muſt beſpeak him in St. *Pauls* Language: *Thou that abhorreſt Idols, doſt thou commit Sacriledge?* Rom. 2.

But *T. E.* (forſooth) to culver with the Impropriators, thinks to engage them all againſt me; as if I put them into the ſame predicament with the Firſt alienators, which is a groſs miſtake: And (God knows) I covet nothing from them, but do truly pity the circumſtances that they are in, as I do all other men, who are enriched with the ſpoils of the Church.

However if all things were as He argues; Sacriledge would be as much a Virtue as a Vice, and *Ananias* and *Saphira* may be put into the Calender of the Quakers Martyrs, who do juſtify that thing for which they ſuffer'd. And now that I maintain *Ananias* and *Saphira*, I wiſh *T. E.* would read Mr. *Medes* 37th *Diſ-*

courſe, which fully ſtates both their ſin and puniſhment; and then I hope He will bluſh, for being ingaged in ſo bad a cauſe.

Par. To Prove that Tithes were not Popiſh, You produced Proteſtant Martyrs that received them: You inſtanc'd in *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Hooper*, *Bradford* and *Taylor*. *Theſe* (He confeſſes) *were Godly men and worthy Martyrs*; but He thinks *they had not ſo clear a ſight into all the abominations and ſuperſtitions of* Rome, *becauſe they lived but in the day-break of the Reformation*; *and that there were divers things which they took no notice of*, *that are plainly condemned*, &c. this is the ſum of *p.* 305, 306, 307.

Min. It ſeems then a man may be *Godly*, may be a *worthy Martyr*, may *enter into a Crown of life*, as He tells us theſe did; yet in this life come ſhort of perfection: for it ſeems theſe Martyrs were ſo far from being perfect, that they took no notice of *divers things plainly condemned*, and left the Reformation it ſelf imperfect. Compare this with his Chapter of perfection, and ſee what conſiſtency there is between them. Beſides they lived a good while after the Reformation was begun by *Martin Luther*. Neither was there any thing of Moment fit to be reformed, which they left unreformed; being wonderfully endowed with Piety, Wiſdom and Learning for the work they had to perform: Neither wanted they courage nor opportunity to do it. However the Quaker ſhould have told us, what thoſe *many things are*, *which were allowed by them*, *and ſince plainly condemned by others*. I ſuppoſe by theſe [*others*]

Dolus latet in generalibus.

He

He means such as himself, or other factious and schismatick Spirits, who love to oppose any thing which hath the stamp of Authority upon it; who would be always altering and reforming, till they bring all to confusion & ruine.

Par. But to come even with you; as you produced Martyrs that took Tithes, He instanceth in other Martyrs that denied them, namely *Wicklif, Swinderby, Brute and Thorp*, and produces *Fox's* Martyrol. 57 for his authority. *p.*308.

Min. Then let us search *Fox* for two things, first whether these did deny Tithes; but especially whether they were all Martyrs, to parallel the Martyrs which I named, because He saith I *oppose the Martyrs one to another.* p. 309.

As for *Wicklif*, I do believe indeed that He denied the *jus divinum* of Tithes, but then He held them in the nature of *Alms.* Nay He was so far from denying Tithes altogether, that He was a receiver of them, being Parson of *Litterworth.* I believe He looked upon Tithes as due only upon civil sanctions: and the Quaker represents me of the same opinion, and very idly tells his Reader, that Tithes *were wont to be claimed as of Divine right; but that I am not hardy enough to venture my cause upon that Title* p. 277. Therefore He is the more ridiculous in bringing so improper a testimony against me. Martyr. 2. vol. 1. 602, 603

But suppose he had altogether denied Tithes, yet was he no Martyr: For *Fox* tells us that He *quietly departed this Life at* Litterworth. Indeed by order of the Synod of *Constance* His bones were buried 41 years after his Death, and *Fox* has drawn an Effigies of the manner of it;* Mart. 1. vol. p. 583 * p. 605.

But for my part, I ever took a Martyr to be one that Seals his Teſtimony of the truth with his blood. ———

Par. I believe *T. E.* has the ſame notion of a Martyr: For He ſaith *the bleſſed Martyrs Seald their Teſtimony with their blood.* p 306.

Min. I pray then what *blood* was left in *Wickliffs* bones, after they had been buried 41 years?

Par. But what do's *Fox* ſay of *Swinderby*?

Min. He tells us, that He was articled againſt for affirming *that Tithes purely be alms, & in caſe that Curates be evil men, the ſame may be lawfully confer'd to other men.* But withall that He retracted this before the Biſhop of *Lincoln*, & ſets down the very words of this retractation. But for his being a Martyr, *Fox* ſaith, *whether He dyed in Priſon, or whether He eſcaped their hands, or was burned, there is no certain relation made.* And for *Brute*, I confeſs that He alſo was againſt the *jus Divinum* of Tithes: but then He was not againſt Tithes as due by the poſitive laws of men; for he ſaid, *by the traditions of men Chriſtian people are bound to pay them.* And He too made a ſubmiſſion before the Biſhop of *Hereford:* Neither was he a Martyr; For *Fox* ſaith, *what end he had I find it not regiſtred:*

1. vol. p. 607.

ibid.

p. 620.
p. 633.
p. 653.
p. 654.
p. 669.
p. 708.

Thorp too was againſt Tithes, as claimed by Levitical precepts, &c. but then as *Alms* he was not againſt them, if *Fox* may be credited, who is ſo far from recording him a Martyr, that He ſaith expreſly, *His end was uncertain.*

Now

Now I hope you see, what juggling here is, and how unfaithfully and dishonestly He Cites his Authors, when those Men are no more against Tithes, than, as He pretends, I am my self: And whereas He saith *I oppose the Martyrs one against another*, You see that never a Man of these was a Martyr.

But to the point in hand, I must tell you that (if my Author fail me not) in *Italy* (if not all of it, yet in that part where the Pope is Sovereign) the People pay no Tithes at all. To this I shall add another remark of Sir *Thomas Herberts*, that in the Isle of *Socotora*, where the Pope was never own'd and received, even there (says He *) *the Christians have a Patriarch of their own, whom they Reverence, and other of the Clergy to whom they duly pay Tithes, their Feasts and Fasts like ours*, &c. *They use the Cross in Baptism, and the other Sacrament in both kinds.*

Sir *Edwin Sandys's* Survey. sect. 39.

† *Herberts* Travels into *Africa* and *Asia*, p. 31.

Par. But to go on (says T. E.) *from Divine right, you betake your self to your last & surest refuge, making Tithes but a temporal right*, p. 309, 310.

Min. I am sure he goes on to falsifie; for I said no such thing: To say they are a temporal right is one thing, to say they are but a temporal right is another. All that I aim'd at (as my words do testifie) is that we have the same Title to our Tithes, that other Men have to their Estates; enjoying them by a National consent in positive and establish'd Laws.

Par. Yet he has a way to evade this, by telling us, *that he claims his Estate in a natural*

and civil capacity, without relation to a Miniſterial Function, p 311.

Min. This will paſs for an Argument, when He can prove that the Miniſters of the Goſpel ought to be reputed *Outlaws*, and what is ſet apart for ſuch, ought to be expoſed to the rapine of every Sacrilegious Ruffian.

And if humane Laws be a good plea for other Men, I do not know why they ſhould be a bad plea for us, and this may ſerve to anſwer ſeveral of his pages, where he beats the Air with a repetition of a company of vain and empty words.

Par. After you had at large proved, that the continuation of Tithes in the Church is no ſin, becauſe reſtrained by no Law, Humane or Divine; and though *T.E.* durſt not there encounter you, yet he pays you off for concluding thus, *If the Quakers can prove from the Laws of God or right reaſon, that it is not lawful for every one to do what he will with his own, and conſequently that he may not ſettle Tithes Lands, or Moneys upon the Clergy; then they do ſomething to the purpoſe*, &c. *Well then* (ſays He) *that I may do ſomething to the purpoſe, I will prove both from the Laws of God and right reaſon, that its not Lawful for every one to do what he will with his own: He may not imploy it to an evil uſe*, &c. *He may not make an Idol of them, its not lawful to lay out his Money in Beads, Croſſes, Crucifixes*, and *ſo He goes on.* p. 320, 221.

Min. Our Quaker is very true to his Method, to leave his Argument (which here was to prove the ſettlement of Tithes upon the Church

Church to be a ſin) to catch at, or play upon a Word or Phraſe, to exerciſe upon it his abuſive wit and ſophiſtry. I perſwade my ſelf that every honeſt Reader doth take my words to ſignifie no more than this; that where I have a free Eſtate, I have a power to keep or alienate it: Wherefore ſays St. *Peter* to *Ananias*, *Whilſt it remained was it not thine own? and after it was ſold, was it not in thine own power?* Acts 5.4.

This however I cannot but take notice of, that if the Quaker can but ſpit his malice againſt me, he cares not, though it fly in our Saviours own Face, whoſe very words I uſed, and to whoſe plain ſenſe I referred, when I mentioned them to you: See *Mat.* 20,15. *Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine Eye evil becauſe I am good?* But it ſeems *Ellwood* can tell our Saviour another ſtory, and *will prove from the Laws of God and right reaſon, that it is not Lawful for every Man to do what he will with his own*, &c.

Par. But I paſs by this profanation, He ſuppoſes, *that if* Ethelwolf *had an ample power of diſpoſing what he pleaſed, or that the People had by conſent joyned with him in the Donation every Man according to the intereſt that he had, yet neither could He, nor they grant more than belonged to themſelves*, p. 323.

Min. Suppoſe I grant it, what then?

Par. To make a grant of the tenth part for ever is (in his underſtanding) *utterly repugnant to reaſon*, p. 324.

Min. Is it reaſonable wholly to paſs an Eſtate from them and their Heirs for ever, and

yet repugnant to reaſon to grant but a part of that Eſtate for ever?

Par, He has a way to evade this too: For he ſaith, that *it muſt be conſidered that by the Profits of the Land is not underſtood the natural only, but the artificial product thereof; not what the Earth of her own accord, without the help of Man brings forth; but what by the painful labour, toil, care, ſweat, and great charge of the diligent and induſtrious Husbandman is digged, and as it were torn out of her Bowels.* ibid.

Min. I will propound you a Caſe: Suppoſe you were ſeiz'd in Fee-ſimple of an Eſtate valuable at 100 *l. per an.* Might you not out of that Eſtate charge 10 *l. per an.* for ever, to ſuch and ſuch uſes?

Par. This I fancy *T. E.* himſelf will not queſtion.

Min. Then muſt I tell him, that 10 *l. per an.* is *not the natural product of the Land, not what the Earth of her own accord brings forth*: but muſt be fetch't from the *Indies*; and muſt *be procur'd by the labour, toil, care, and charge of the diligent and induſtrious Husbandman*, &c. Now I muſt ask, why it ſhould be thought more unreaſonable for the Husbandman to pay ſuch things as the Ground it ſelf brings forth, than to pay ſuch a ſum of Money, which muſt be brought from the remoteſt parts of the World?

Par. Believe me, I am not able to anſwer you: *But (ſays T. E.) if* Ethelwolf's *conſideration be taken away* (which it ſeems was for the health of his Soul) *why ſhould the charge continue?* p. 326.

Min. you have the parallel Caſe of *Magna Charta*

Charta already, by which the Engliſh Subjects do differ from the Subjects of *France*; which by this reaſon ought as well to be void as *Ethelwolf*'s Charter?

But then what is all this to the preſent payers of Tithes? If the Clergy muſt not gain by the Charter, why muſt the Laity have the advantage of it, who have a valuable conſideration for what they pay?

But let us ſeriouſly conſider of the Caſe: If the Clergy muſt not have the revenue they are in poſſeſſion of, who muſt? Will *T.E.* find out the Heirs of *Ethelwolf*, and of that People who joyned with him in the Donation? But ſuppoſe he cannot, or ſuppoſe the Caſe worſe than He ſtates it, that Tithes had been ſet out for the worſhip of the Devil, and the original proprietors, nor any claiming under them in being: what is fit to be done in ſuch a Caſe as this?

Par. In ſuch a Caſe the ſupreme Authority of a Nation ought to proceed to a reformation, and change them from a bad uſe to a good.

Min. Had the Original of Tithes been never ſo ill, yet we ſee that our Laws have ſo reformed the Church, that they are not now uſed to any ſuch Idolatrous ends and purpoſes. Were not thoſe Cenſers that we have been diſcourſing of, though Conſecrated by wicked Men in ſo rebellious a manner, wrought out into broad Plates for Gods own Altar?

Surely the Quaker fancies, that whatſoever has been abuſed to Idolatry, *&c.* cannot be reformed to a pious uſe afterwards: If ſo, then muſt Tithes rot in the Fields, and no Body meddle with them. Suppoſe the whole Turkiſh Empire

Empire (through Gods mercy) should be Converted to Christianity: May not the Mufti himself, and those whom *T. E.* calls *Emaums*, together with all the Mosks and Revenues now belonging to them, be reconsecrated to Christianity? Is Idolatry of that contaminating nature, that no reformation can purge it? how then came *Aaron* to Officiate in the Priests Office, after he had made the Molten Calf, and said, *These be thy Gods which brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt?

p. 21.

Exod. 32. 4.

Par. But if Tithes (saith *T. E.*) *were a suitable maintenance, the Clergy now does nothing for the People which can deserve so great a compensation*, p. 329.

Min. That is, If his Worship may be Judge. But what I wonder do the Impropriators for the People, which deserve *so great a compensation*? Besides, it's all one to the People, whether they pay Tithes or no. As I shall shew you anon.

Par. You said that *our only work is to explain the written word of God, & to apply the same.* From these words he concludes, *that what you do for the People, is not suitable to the reward of Tithes*, p. 329, 330.

Min. Do's not this Quaker (think you) instruct the People very graciously? As if Tithes were of more real value to them, than the word of God explained and applied?

But I must not let the abuse pass, which he hath put upon me in this Quotation. He so states my words, as his Reader must understand him, that I make explaining and applying the word of God, the sole and the only work of a Minister. In

In the place He quotes I am treating of *Infallible inſpiration*, together with thoſe *extraordinary gifts which the Apoſtles had, and that they are now ceaſed: and that we take Texts to ſhew, that we have no other Doctrine to deliver, but what is taken out of the written word of God*, then I ſaid, *our only work is to explain and apply the ſame*: [only work] related to the particular which I was there diſcourſing of, and not to the general Office of a Miniſter. Here you may ſee how unconſcionably the Quaker ſtates my words, contrary to their plain ſenſe & meaning.

Par. I perceive he would flatter the People into a conceit, that you receive the Tithes from their kindneſs and courteſie.

Min. Indeed the People do pay us our Tithes, but they do not give them; *to pay is one thing, to give another.*

Should I tell *T. E.* that a certain Gentleman pays me a Rent-charge out of his Eſtate, who reading this Quakers Book, may tell me that I do nothing for him, which deſerves *ſo great a compenſation*; And though I owe the party all the civility and kindneſs imaginable, ſuitable to his real worth and quality; yet ſhould I tell him, that I have no obligation at all to him, upon the account of the Rent-charge he pays me, for it was none of his benefaction, but the kindneſs of an Anceſtor, who charged the Lands therewith, which if he had diſlik'd, he might have let them alone. So the People pay us our Tithes; but than it's no thanks to them, nor burden neither, ſeeing they muſt have paid them, or what is as valuable, to ſome body elſe.

Par.

Par. You call'd *Tithes a Freehold*, this Nettles him extremely, becauſe that proves them a diſtinct property: But he deſires you to ſhew *thoſe Laws, to produce thoſe Statutes, that have Tithes a Freehold to the Clergy*, p.331.

Min. Who ever before this Quaker required a Statute to prove a Freehold? I thought the Repreſentives of Freeholders, with the concurrence of the King and Peers had made thoſe Statutes which he calls on me to produce: I pray who elect the Parliament Men that ſerve for the County?

Par. The Freeholders.

Min. And did you never ſee Clergymens Votes enter'd at one of thoſe Elections?

Par. Yes many a time.

Min. That very thing proves them Freeholders. So that you ſee *T.E.* is no better a Lawyer than a Divine: For he ſhould have gone to the Common Law, and not to the Statute Law, to prove a Freehold.

Par. I find however, that He has conſulted ſome Statutes for the payment of Tithes, and diſcovers a Fundamental error in them, Namely, *that Tithes ſhould be due to God and Holy Church; now the reaſon of the Law* (ſays He) *being taken away, the Law it ſelf muſt ceaſe*, p.335.

Min. The Reaſon of the Law will prove a fundamental truth: For *Tithes are due to God and Holy Church*, either by a Divine Right, or at leaſt by a ſolemn dedication of them:

Par. But this ſcurvy word [property] vexes him; For He ſays *nothing leſs will ſerve your turn*, p.336.

Min.

Min. No, nothing leſs will ſerve my turn.

Par. But then he enquires, *where its veſted: in whom* (ſaith He) *doth it lie? is it in the Perſon of the Prieſt? no ſuch matter: For a Man may be a Prieſt in Orders, and yet have no power to demand Tithes*, &c. *So that the property* (*if there were any*) *would lie in the Office*, ibid.

Min. What Office do's He mean by *Office?*

Par. He propounds the Queſtion himſelf: *And what is the Office?* ibid.

Min. But how do's He reſolve it?

Par. Thus: *It was to be ſure a Popiſh Office, when Tithes were firſt paid to it in this Nation*, ib.

Min. Is this an Anſwer to a Queſtion? What was then that Popiſh Office?

Par. That He do's not tell us: but I ſuppoſe He means the Office of a Prieſt; For He ſaith, *the Prieſt hath nothing to do with Tithes, until by Preſentation, Inſtitution, and Induction he is inveſted with Office.* ibid.

Min. Wonderful Learned Nonſenſe! Yet I muſt tell him, that neither Preſentation, nor Inſtitution, nor Induction, nor theſe altogether, inveſt a Man with the Office of Prieſt. In ſhort, he confounds himſelf by diſtinguiſhing between the Perſon and the Office, as he calls it: and becauſe this property does not belong to either of them apart, therefore he concludes there is no property at all, whereas the property belongs to the Perſon, as qualified by Holy Orders, and put into actual poſſeſſion by Inſtitution and Induction.

Par. He thinks he has a clever Argument to prove you have no property in Tithes: *For* (He

(He ſays) *to manifeſt the emptineſs of your plea, you have no property, until the Owner, by ſetting it out for you, hath made you one.* p. 337.

Min. Suppoſe a Landlord ſets a Farm for 10 *l. per an.* Has He not a property to ſuch a Sum, though not to any particular Coin, till ſuch time as he hath received it? So we have a property to a tenth, though not to ſuch a particular Sheaf, until ſuch time as it is Tithed and ſet out for us.

Par. There is one argument more, which He ſeems wonderfully fond of: with which He fills up many of his pages, (*viz.*) that you have the Tithe of the Husbandmans *labour*, *toil*, *ſweat*, *care*, *charge*, *diligence*, nay in one place He thinks you *lay claim to his underſtanding*. p. 325.

Min. Whoever reaps the Tithe of *T. E's.* Underſtanding, will not find himſelf much enriched by it: And I muſt tell the Quaker, that if Lands could bring forth without labour, toil, charge, *&c.* and Tenants pay no more than they do, the argument would look with more ſhew of reaſon; but as the caſe ſtands, its a perfect fallacy.

There wanted not thoſe who ſuggeſted ſuch ſtuff as this to the people, in the days of the Prophet *Malachi*, as if they were ſqueezed and impoveriſhed by the payment of their Tithes; wherefore God calls on them to try, whether they ſhould be loſers by it. *Bring ye* (ſaith He) *all the Tithes into the ſtore-houſe, that there may be meat in my houſe, and prove me now herewith, if I will not open the windows of Heaven, and pour ye out a bleſſing, that there*

ſhall

ſhall not be room enough to receive it. So certainly thoſe that pay their Tithes in a conſcientious regard to God, as conſecrated to his Worſhip and Service, may be ſure to be no loſers, and that God will open the windows of Heaven, and give a bleſſing to their labour, toil, care, & diligence; will bleſs their crops and their cattels, when in the mean time all ſacrilegious Robbers do trouble their own Houſes, are Enemies to themſelves and Families, depriving themſelves of *Gods bleſſing*, which only *maketh rich*, being not unlike to the Eagle in the Fable, who ſtole a Coal from the Altar, and carrying it to her Neſt, ſet therewith both her Young, and Neſt on fire.

Da decimas & in hoc deteſcas. A Jewiſh Proverb.

Tithes have been long ſettled in the Nation, and the Church's right to them being antecedent to any Proprietors of Land, who bought their Eſtates liable to ſuch an Incumbrance, and conſequently, had a proportionable deduction in the purchaſe-Money, and ſo no injury to them; and if ſo, why ſhould they grumble at the payment of that which was never reckoned to them in the purchaſe?

Par. Yes (ſays *T.E.*) *they purchaſed all that was not excepted out of the purchaſe.* p.344.

Min. But Tithes were excepted out of the purchaſe: For every body knows that they were excepted by the Law of the Nation, and therefore it would have been impertinent to have excepted them in the the Body of the Purchaſe-Deed. But if any Lands are to be ſold, which are exempted from the payment of Tithes, than to be ſure the Purchaſer ſhall hear

hear of that in both his Ears, and for such a convenience must pay to a Farthing.

A Friend of mine was lately concern'd in the purchase of a little Meadow-close, the strict Tithe of which was computed at 5*s. per an.* but the Parson was bound up by a *Modus* or Composition of 2*d. per an.* payable at *Candlemas.* Possibly you will say my Friend had a convenience here, that he paid but 2*d.* instead of hay worth 5*s.* by the year: but then I must tell you, that its no convenience at all, for his exemption from the Tithes in kind (to my knowledge) cost him 5*l.* extraordinary in the purchase.

This is not a particular, but the general case of all *England:* For in matters of contract and bargain the common rule is, *tanti valet, quanti vendidi potest*, every thing is valued, for what it may be sold; and where men meet with conveniencies, they are made to pay for them; and where they meet incumbrances, there they do call for proportionable Deductions: And the Landlords case descends to the Tenant, who pays more or less, according to the Nature and Quality of the thing He holds.

Par. But *T. E.* says, *that it is questionable, whether a Tenant pays less Rent in consideration of Tithes.* p. 345.

Min. Suppose then two Farms of equal value in themselves. One pays Tithes, the other pays none, and both these belong to one man: Now is any man so senseless as to question, wether the Landlord does not value the Farm as highly which pays Tithes, as the other which

which is exempted? *T. E.* may lead the Quakers by the Noſe (as He ſaith I do my Pariſhioners) and perſwade them that the Moon is made of Green Cheeſe, and that two and three make not five, as thus to diſpute againſt demonſtration, and queſtion that which every body knows to be unqueſtionable.

Par. However He'l *undertake to demonſtrate, that the abatement, which he is ſuppoſed to have in his Rent, is not proportionable or anſwerable to the value of the Tithes he pays.* ibid.

Min. I perceive the Quaker begins to ſneak, an abatement it ſeems there is, but not ſuch an abatement as is proportionated to the Tithes: But let us hear his demonſtration.

Par. Suppoſe (ſays He) *a Landlord lets a Farm for* 90 l. *a year, which if it were Tithe-free would yield an* 100 l. *The Tenant to pay his Rent, defray all Charges*, &c. *muſt raiſe three times as much as his Rent comes to, which will make* 270 l. *the tenth part of which is* 27 l. *So that if the Tenant ſhould have* 10 l. *abated in his Rent becauſe of Tithes, than do's he pay* 17 l. *more than is allowed in his Rent*, p. 345, 346.

Min. Cals He this demonſtration, when He has ſo ſtated the Caſe, that no certain eſtimate can be made of the Tithes of ſuch a Farm? A Farm of that value conſiſting in Tillage may be worth (as He ſays) 27 l. *per an.* or a Farm of that value conſiſting in Paſturage may not yield ſeven ſhillings a Year to the Parſon, for it may be eaten with Horſes, and then *T. E.* tells us, *that very little, if any thing at all, is recoverable for Tithe*, *p.* 340. Now is it likely that a

Landlord would take ten pounds for that which is worth 27 pounds, or above 10 *l.* in conſideration of a Tithe, when the Tenant pays not above ſeven ſhillings, or nothing at all? and indeed the one is as probable as the other. But to paſs by his Caſe ſo fallaciouſly ſtated: I wil ive him a real Caſe.

There is one, whom I could name, that ſent to my ſelf to purchaſe the intereſt which He had in a certain Prebendal Leaſe, to which there belonged a Farm, rented at 30*l. per an.* I made choice of two Neighbours to view the pariculars of that Farm, and to inform me, whether in their Judgment the Occupant had ſuch a Tack, as he might be able by his *labour*, *toil*, *charge*, &c. to maintain his Family, and pay me my Rent: The Method they took to ſatiſfy me herein, was to know what rates other men in the ſame Village paid for their Farms, which being computed and compared together, they found, that this Farm was not worth above the annual Rent of 25*l.* according to the Rates that other men paid for the Grounds they held of the like nature. This was objected to the Seller, who returned this anſwer, *that it was a miſtake that this Farmer paid more than his Neighbours: true it was, that he paid more Rent, but then he had a recompence for it, being diſcharged from Tithes, which priviledge the other Neighbours had not, who accordingly had an abatement in their Rents.* So that one Neighbour was no better than another: He that paid Tithes had leſs Rent to pay; and He that had no Tithes to pay was no better, ſeeing He paid

paid the value of them in his Rent. And had I gone on with the purchase, I had received no benefit by that exemption, which I must have bought. And I do perswade my selfe there are thousands of the like cases to be found.

But suppose a Quaker enjoy a Farm of *90l. per an.* Rent, and the Landlord abate *10l.* a year in consideration of Tithes. Or be it questionable whether He abate any thing upon that consideration. I'l tell you what is not questionable, that the Quaker will pay nothing, and will pay this neither to the Landlord nor Priest, and so the one of them shall be sure to be Cozen'd by him.

Now if a Quaker which Farms *90l. per an.* should say, *Its true Landlord, I should have paid thee* 100l. *but that thou deducts me ten pounds upon the Consideration of Tithes: truly Tithes I dare not pay, but for the ten pounds I have brought it to thy self*, &c. But I would have *T. E.* to name me one Quaker that ever did thus, then I shall have a better opinion of his Morals, than I have of many of that Fraternity.

Par. However *T. E.* thinks *that there is a great deal of difference between a Landlord and a Priest in their dealing: The Landlord doth not take, or desire the whole encrease and profit that is made upon his Farm.* ibid.

Min. Nor the Priest.

Par. T. E. saith *the Landlords take no more for the Rent of his Land, than it is supposed the Tenant may make double so much to himself. But when the Mercileſs Priest comes* &c. *like the* Sabeans *and* Chaldeans, *He falls on,*

and ſweeps all away together. p. 347.

Min. Is not this a modeſt Quaker think you? If the Landlord do allow a part upon the account of Charges: Tithes are part of that Charge which it ſeems is allowed by the Landlord, and therefore no loſs to the Tenant.

How compaſſionate doth he make the Landlord? (would to God they were all truly ſo) and how cruel and mercileſs doth he repreſent the Prieſts? Now to ſhew that this is downright malice and envy, Let it be conſider'd, that the greateſt part of the Tithes of *England* (to the great diſhonour and ſin of our Nation, may it be ſaid) are impropriate, and that the greateſt Landlords in the Nation have gotten away the Tithes from the Church. Now as kind as he makes them, do they uſe the People better than the mercileſs Prieſts? do they ſay in *T. E's* Language to the People: *Neighbours though I claim the tenth part, yet ſeeing you have been at* pag. 347. *the pains and charge to get it for me, I'l deal no worſe with you, than I do with my other Tenants, take one part, and leave you two: ſo divide the Tithes into three parts, I'l be content with one of them, and do you keep the other two for the pains and charge you have been at in procuring it.* Now is it uſual with Impropriators thus to beſpeak the People? If not, then muſt He account for thoſe foul ſlanders, which He hath wickedly caſt upon the Clergy: As if they were mercileſs and cruel; Nay they only ſo. From my heart do I pray to God to bring him to a ſenſe, and to forgive him ſo great a wickedneſs.

Par

Par. I remember you acquainted me that the King has a great Revenue out of the Tithes; namely, the First-fruits and Tenths, which you are disabled to discharge, if your Tithes be withdrawn: so that the Quakers are in this point as well Enemies to the King as the Clergy; and consequently to the Government it self, which is supported by it. Now I do not find that *T. E.* answers the Argument, but catches at a Phrase, that you should call the *First-fruits and Tenths one of the fairest Flowers belonging to the Crown. Herein* (He says) *you are like the Crow, which is said to think her own Bird white, though others see it to be black. And that no Flower can be fair in an English Crown, which was taken out of a Popes Mitre,* p. 355.

Min. Was there ever so dull a comparison? Do's he call the First-fruits and Tenths my *Crow*? if (forsooth) they must be a Crow, is it mine or the Kings? And though it be plain that my words related not to the Kings Prerogative, but Revenue; Yet seeig the Quaker will have it so, I shall tell you, that its very true that this Flower stuck once in the Triple Crown, but then it was stole from the English Diadem.

I confess the Pope did challenge the Supremacy over the Church and Clergy. The first-fruits and Tenths, was a Homage, whereby the Clergy did own and acknowledge that Supremacy: The Kings of *England* did themselves that right, as to take the Supremacy to themselves, and the First-fruits and Tenths as an acknowledgment thereof.

That you may understand what is included in the Supremacy, I shall acquaint you with a Case. It was disputed in the Popish Schools, Whether a Clergy man could be guilty of Treason against a Temporal Prince? and resolved in the Negative, *because Treason supposes a relation between a Sovereign and a Subject: And a Clergyman being Subject to the Pope only, therefore could he not be guilty of Treason against a Temporal Prince.*

Now you see I hope what was included in the Popes claim to Supremacy, and upon what account the First-fruits and Tenths are now paid, which if the King should part with all, even in *Ellwoods* sense, He would part with the *fairest Flower belonging to His Crown.*

Par. The Quakers used to call Ministers Hirelings for receiving their allotted maintenances. And therefore in their usual way of railing, used to charge you with selling God's word to the People. To this you said, that they may as well *say the Judges sells Justice, because they have an honourable allowance from the Exchequer*: He thinks the Parallel will not hold; *you pretend to be Ministers of Christ, whereas they pretend no higher, than to be Ministers of State*, p. 356.

Min. I thought that every Magistrate had been a Minister of God: St. *Paul* had ill luck, that he had not our inspired *Ellwood* to correct him, when he said, *He is the Minister of God to thee for good*, &c. *and beareth not the Sword in vain.*

Rom. 13. 1. 4.

We

We are Miniſters of God, Magiſtrates are Miniſters of Juſtice, and conſequently Miniſters of God too: They are diſpenſers of Juſtice, we of the word of God; may not then they with equal reaſon be ſaid to ſell Juſtice, becauſe they receive their maintenances, as we to ſell the word of God, becauſe we receive our maintenancrs? Is not the Analogy the ſame? Thus you ſee with what pitiful ſhifts the Quaker eludes the truth, and deludes his ignorant Party.

Par. You have made me ſufficiently ſenſible of *T. E*'s many tricks and fallacies, I ſhall peruſe that Diſcourſe (however) you referr me to, where I perceive this Chapter of Tithes is handled at large: So that I ſhall give you no further diſturbance about this Subject: Now let me mind you, that whereas the Quakers (to make Magiſtrates as uſeleſs as Miniſters) uſed to declaim againſt going to Law upon any occaſion whatſoever, *T.E.* in contradiction to his Brethren ſays, *In civil Caſes it is no injuſtice for a Man to recover his due by Law*, 361.

Min. Has the Quakers received ſome new diſpenſation from Heaven? If not, how comes it to be lawful to go to Law now in civil Caſes, when twenty years ago the ſame thing was denied by them as unlawful? The Spirit then by which the Quakers pretend to be inſpired, either differs from it ſelf, or is not the ſame Spirit which the Quakers ſo lately pretended to.

Is not this enough to make you abandon for ever all thoughts of Quakerism, when you find their Religion is not fixt, when we know not where to to have them, nor how long to keep them in one mind?

One of them told me very lately, *that I accused the Quakers falsly in saying that they neglect to crave a blessing upon their Meat, which is now frequently practis'd among them.* I am glad to hear of any Reformation among them, and would to god they would leave off the rest of their fooleries: but if this be their minds now, formerly they talked at another rate: *what* (said they) *we crave a Blessing when we go to meat? that's stinting the Spirit to a Meal, to a Breakfast, a Dinner, or a Supper.* That is, must the Spirit just come, when the Stomach comes? And if the Quakers say Grace now at Meals; yet herein do they take away the Reason of their Dumb Meetings. This is to shew you what a shifting People they are, and how unconstant they are to their own Assertions: but to the case in hand:

It seems then *T. E.* will allow it now lawful to go to Law in civil Cases (how unlawful soever it was before) and I suppose He was wary enough in asserting this; because He cannot but be Conscious, that going to Law is a thing frequently practis'd by the Quakers. But then here I must desire them to take notice, that as dishonourable as they say Oaths are to Christianity, yet they will make their Appeals to Sessions and Assizes, bring Actions, &c. though they know there can be

no

no proceedings in any Court, but that both Witneſſes and Juries muſt give their Evidences and Verdicts upon Oath. If then it be truly ſo, why will they be any occaſion to bring a diſgrace and reproach upon Chriſtianity?

Notwithſtanding the Quakers talk ſo loudly againſt Oaths, many of them (to have the benefit of Wills and Adminiſtrations) have taken Oaths, as I am able to make out. An Attorney of great account and practiſe, told me lately, that two Quakers (Clients of his) took their Oaths in an Anſwer to an *Exchequer* Bill, and very formally too, put off their Hats, and kiſs'd the Book. The late Biſhop of *Lincoln*, being either as Plaintiff or Defendant, concern'd in a Chancery Suit, a Quaker at a Commiſſion, came very formally to ſwear againſt him: One of the Commiſſioners (from whom I had the account) ask't him, How it came to paſs that he being a Quaker would ſwear? He told him, *Thou knoweſt that among Huntſmen it was never thought amiſs to kill a Fox or Badger, by any means; ſuch being allowed no fair play*, &c. leaving it to himſelf to make the application.

You ſee then that it's lawful to go to Law in civil Caſes, to ingage others to ſwear, and ſometimes to ſwear themſelves: As if intereſt and envy ought to take place, though contrary to the Principles and Honour of Chriſtianity.

God

God knows I mention none of these things out of any envious Principle, but to discover to the Quakers the danger that they are in: From which Good God deliver them for His blessed Names sake.

Amen.

The

The Concluſion.

Par. IN the concluſion of *T. E*'s Book, having firſt falſly told His Reader, that *He had given a particular Anſwer to the moſt material paſſages in yours*: He gives you a warning from writing any more againſt the Quakers, for if you do, you may expect him on your Bones again; For He ſaith, that He no way doubts, but that the Lord *will enable him, or ſome of his Servants to vindicate his truth*, p. 363.

Min. God no doubt will take care of his truth, but if He enable *T. E.* to write, we may be confident that it will be a Recantation of what he hath already writ. However let not him think that his idle Threats will diſcourage me in duty of doing good.

Par. His main Buſineſs here, is to preſent His Reader with a collection of ſome of your Phraſes, which He calls *Virulent Expreſſions*, and which He ſaith *your Academical Education hath beſtowed upon you.* p. 364.

Min. Whether my Expreſſions were Virulent or no: This I am ſure, here's a foul and impudent Slander, in charging my *Academical Education* therewith: but wherein do's this Virulency appear?

Par. His firſt Inſtance is this, *the Spirit of Quakeriſm and the Deluſions of it.* ibid.

Min. This mind's me of an old Woman who corrected Her Maid for ſwearing, becauſe She

She call'd a Hen a Jade: Is not the Quaker think you, ſadly put to't, when (for want of matter) He falls upon ſuch innocent expreſſions as theſe? I muſt confeſs I could not forbear ſmiling, when I found not only *a Fanatical Jeſuit*, for a woful bitter expreſſion, but *the whim in the pate* put into his Catologue: Pray do you remember upon what account it was ſpoken?

Par. Yes: For to vindicate Scripture from the idle fancies of ſome: You ſuppoſed *a Man troubled with a Vertigo in his Head, ſhould ſay he was confident the Earth turned round*, you askt, *whether it was the Earth or the Diſtemper in the Brain that occaſioned that miſapprehenſion*; ſo (ſaid you) *every Fanatick will tell you that he has the Scripture on his ſide, in behalf of his opinions, where is the fault? in the Scripture? or in the Whim in his Pate?*

Conf. p. 95, 96.

Min. You ſee then, how that expreſſion concern'd all Fanaticks in general: and is it not very pleaſant, that (to prove me virulent) He ſhould take [Fanatick] to himſelf and Party?

Par. You ſaid *the Quakers were Cheats and Impoſtors*, ibid.

Min. Its true I ſaid it, but not before I firſt plainly proved it. You know the Quakers pretend to immediate Teaching, and that they ſpeak and write by the infallible dictates of the Spirit of God: if ſo, then muſt all their works be as authentick, and of equal Authority with the Scriptures themſelves,

ſelves. Now having diſcovered their groſs ignorance in the interpretation and application of that ſaying of *Jeremiah*, *The Prieſts bear rule by their means*, How could I be true to the Souls of Men in ſaying leſs? Had *T. E.* clear'd his Brethren from the impoſture, He had effectually convicted me of virulency: But he is ſo farr from clearing them in this point (though their credit lay at ſtake) that he ſneaks off without taking any notice of it, as was obſerved before.

Should I forwarn a Traveller from coming in ſuch place, and tell him that the People there are Thieves and Robbers, if they were honeſt Men, or I know nothing to the contrary, my fault would be very heinous; But if I knew them to be ſuch, it would be a breach of Juſtice and Charity to hide it from the Traveller. Alas, what I ſaid of the Quakers were not bitter expreſſions, but ſo many ſad and ſerious truths, and ſpoken out of a Principle of the trueſt charity and kindneſs, to prevent their running headlong into eternal ruine and deſtruction.

But if no ſuch expreſſions can proceed but from a *malevolent*, *cruſty*, *waſpiſh*, *and virulent* Principle, then let me ask my Friend *Ellwood*, whether there is not ſuch a People in the World, who uſe to call Miniſters *Dumb dogs*, *Hirelings*, *Serpents*, *Baals Prieſts*, and wnat not? If he will be pleaſed to conſult the works of His *weighty* Friend *Hubberthorn*, He may there collect a large Catalogue indeed of expreſſions, truly virulent and bitter:

Or

Or let me tell him of another, whose memory (I suppose) is much dearer to him, I mean Ed. *Burroughs*, who in his Works hath these expressions, *Reprobate*, *Child of darkness*, *a Stranger to the Life*, *in the Sorcery and Witchcraft*, *Dragon*, *Diviner*, and many more such like. p.29.32.

He that had seen no more of *T. E's* Book than the Conclusion, would (at the first blush) take him for such a gentle, sweet, and humble Quaker, that one would imagine that the Royal Society had been trying some Experiment upon him, and that they had taken out the very Splene out of his Side: If this be so in truth, Those Gentlemen must excuse me, if I tell them in plain terms, that they have proved themselves no good Artists, in that they have left the main matter behind: Therefore I shall give you some of his expressions, and do you judge whether they be Virulent, or no: *The Author of that book, partly through Ignorance, but principally through Envy*: in the first page of his Preface. *Ay but might the Parishioner have said, He told me that I must not be covetous, yet of all my acquaintance I know none more Covetous than He: He told me I must not be drunk, yet have I seen him so often: He told me I must live chastly, yet He himself was incontinent*, and so he goes on, p.23. *The whole Book shews him big with envie*, p. 25. *Bishop* Gauden *was as bold, and no less blind than himself*, p,171. *His envie and evil nature* p. 210. *My greedy Adversary*, p. 286. *This Priest like a saucy and unthankful Son*, p. 279: *And*

And when the mercileſs Prieſt comes, p. 347. To omit divers others, in this very concluſion, *This Mans malevolent Tongue*. So that I ſhall not imitate him in concluding with a ſaying of *Cornelius Tacitus*'s, but with a much better Author, namely, St. *Paul* in *Rom.* 2. 2. *For wherein thou judgeſt another, thou condemneſt thy ſelf, for thou that judgeſt doſt the ſame things.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 4. Line 20. read *controversial*, p. 18. l. 19. r. *people*, ibid. l. 24. r. *ordinary*, p. 27. l. 30. r. *ingenuously*, p. 32. l. 1. r. *bespatter*, p. 33. l. 3. for *or* r. *our*. p. 47. l. 2. r. *discourse*, p. 52. l. 1. dele *sons*. p. 56. l. 32. r. *Mile-stone*, p. 59. l. 3. r. *word*, p. 60, l. 24 after *how* add *much*, p. 75. l. 33. after *times* add *did express themselves by*, p. 76. l. 7. r. *fightings*, p. 80. l. 24. r. *ingenuous*, p. 82. l. 20. r. *mis-state*, p. 107. l. 10. r. *ὀλίγοι*, p. 114. l. 31. after *is* add *not*, p. 120. l. 4. dele *not*, p. 129. l. 7. r. *Scriptures*, p. 134. l. 25. r. *Ecclus.* 27. 11. p. 140. l. 11. r. *Corruptible*, p. 147. l. 21. r. *abominations*, p. 150. marg. r. *cap* 3. p. 160. l. 3. for 104. r. 94. ibid. l. 22. d. *be*, p. 166. marg. r. *κοινῶ*, ibid. for *and* r. *et*, p. 167. marg. r. *Sen. Ep.* 96, p. 170. l. 11. r. *ἔχε*, p. 173. marg. r. *κείσθω*. ibid. r. *δέχεσθαι*, p. 183. l. 15. r. *Οἱ*, p. 184. l. 1. after *But* add *to*. p. 188. l. 12. d. *his*, p. 192. l. 22. after *before* add p. 169, 177. p. 193. marg. r. *in* 9. *Tracept*. p. 197. l. 4. for *satisfy*. r. *falsify*, p. 199 l. 6. for *you* r. *your*, p. 204. l. 19. after *Law* add *was*, p. 207. l. 14. r. *hands*, p. 211. l. 9. d. *To &c.* p. 212. r. *οὐρανῷ*, p. 219. l. 18. r. *sense*, p. 223. l. 25. r. *Ὡς*, p. 224. l. 30. r. *not*, p. 225. l. 33. after *Ceremonious* add *but*, p. 227. l. 12. r. *a Curse*, p. 238. l. 28. r. *Ancient*, p. 250. l. 17. after *Oaths* add *i.e. against solemn Oaths taken with due circumstances*, p. 251. l. 8. r. *falsly*, ibid. l. 12. r. *ἦν*, p. 252 l. 11. for *yet* r. *that*, ibid. l. 20. r. *δὲ*, ibid. l. 22. d. *by*, ibid. l. 25. r. *τὸν*. p. 259. l. 23. r. *slight*. p. 265 l. 28. and p. 266. l. 8. r. *Precedents*. p. 275. l. 21. before *In* r. *Par*. p. 277. l. 16. r. *from about the year of Christ* 700, *till about the year* 1400. ; ——— p. 286. l. 4. r. *'Tis certain, that the best Quaker of them all, had he not read, studied, conversed, &c. would have been as ignorant as* ———